

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, May 13, 1985

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WRIGHT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 9, 1985.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore on Monday, May 13, 1985.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch, D.D., L.H.D., former Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

You shall do that which is right and good in the sight of the Lord.—Deuteronomy 6:18.

Eternal God, our Father, on this day of days when we assemble with our former companions we pause in your presence to offer unto You the gratitude of our hearts, to receive the ministry of Your grace and to listen to Your quiet voice. You are ever calling us to live with You and to work for You to keep justice and freedom and good will alive in our world. Prosper us in our planning, encourage us in our endeavors, and strengthen us as we step forward for the good of our country and the benefit of the world in which we live.

We pray for our President, our Speaker, the Members of this body, past and present, and for all who labor with them on Capitol Hill. Together may they lead our people in right paths, toward great goals, by noble means, and doing it all with clean minds and pure hearts. To this end we commit ourselves to the guidance of Your spirit for the greater good of our Nation and the brighter benefit of all mankind. Amen and amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 9, 1985, the Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, to receive the former Members of Congress.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECEPTION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT) presided.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. May I say on behalf of the House, and then I should like to recognize the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), to make such comments as he might desire, what a wonderful pleasure it is for us on this day of days to welcome so many of you whose faces are so familiar to us back into this historic Chamber.

You renew our youth as we look out and see you looking so well; you bring back many nostalgic memories, trips taken together, committee sessions held together, conference committees endured together, and so many wonderful memories of things that have gone on.

I understand today that you are honoring a former colleague, former Senator "Bill" Fulbright in a very special way.

I should like to express my own recollections about "Bill" Fulbright.

I first became aware of him when I was in the service in 1943, perhaps it was early 1944, when I was in Australia and would get the abbreviated edition of Time magazine.

I discovered that it was his penmanship that had reduced to an acceptable bit of language a commitment for the United States following that terrible war to accept its responsibilities in the world and not to walk away as it had done following World War I and refused to participate with the other nations of the world.

There had been a Ball and a Burton and a Hill and a Hatch and others who had tried to formulate language. I remember reading that "Bill" Fulbright, then a freshman Member of the House, as I recall, had succeeded in doing that and someone asked him, I think it was about a 25-word declaration that became bipartisan in acceptance, someone asked him how long it had taken him to write it, and Mr. Fulbright said, characteristically, in his

somewhat philosophical way, "I think perhaps about 25 years."

Well, he spent more than 25 years among us as did others here and many, many things have happened as a result.

I welcome you on behalf of the House and our colleagues and I will yield at this time and recognize the gentleman from Mississippi, the acting minority leader, Mr. LOTT.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join on behalf of the Members on this side of the aisle in the House of Representatives, on behalf also of "Bob" MICHEL, our leader, who could not be here today, in extending a bipartisan welcome to our former Members who are here today.

It is good to see so many of you back.

I have done this on a couple of other occasions for our leader, and I have noticed that I am getting a little nervous, actually, because there are more and more of you here as former Members with whom I served, even though this is only my 13th year. I think about half of you here in the Chamber today I have had the pleasure of serving with. I do not know whether that is a message to you or a message to me.

But I will tell you, your ears should be burning because we have been talking a lot about you lately as we get into our various rigors of serving in the House of Representatives.

There are a number of us that somewhat look longingly at you when you come back and look rested, tanned, prosperous, and we wonder whether maybe there really is life after service in the House. That is a fleeting thought; do not mistake me at all. But some of us have been talking a little bit about this tremendous talent, some tremendous people on both sides of the aisle who have served in this House over the years and have gone on to other employment, other avocations in life. We would like maybe to call on you to help us with some of the prickly problems that we deal with in the House. Maybe as we look at trying to find ways to deal with such problems as contested elections or Rules of the House, maybe we could call back a gentleman like the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Rhodes, or the former distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, Mr. Bolling; some of you gentleman could come back and help us confront these problems.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

Maybe we should have some former Members, some present Members, and some prospective Members who could sit with us and help us deal with these problems on House reform and contested elections, budget reform and maybe former Members in a bipartisan effort would help to remove some of the partisanship and could give us a clearer vision of where we have been, but more importantly where we should be going.

So we may be calling on you. Maybe through the Republican Research Committee, we may ask for a task force that would include people like Jerry Ford and John Rhodes and John Roussetot and Dick Bolling and others, to give us some guidance and some counsel of your past experiences.

I am pleased to be here on this occasion, to see good friends again, and thank you for what you've done in the past and warn you that we may be calling on you for the future.

We are glad to have you here, and we will look forward to visiting with you the rest of the day and in the future, and Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, I appreciate your yielding for my opportunity to participate in this activity today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I am going to ask the Clerk to call the roll of former Members of the Congress, but first I am going to ask if John Rhodes of Arizona might like to come and sit here. I remember he said once, on a famous occasion, "I've had my eye on that chair for a long time," and I remember Speaker O'NEILL said, "John, that's all you'll ever get on it."

Now, I wonder if you would like to come and sit here, John, and preside over this occasion.

Mr. RHODES (presiding). Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this great honor. Speaker O'NEILL did this a year ago, as you may recall, and he gave me the same quote which he had given me before, and he was absolutely correct. I have had my eye on this chair, and before long, I am going to put something else on it, thanks to you.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say what a great pleasure it is to see the distinguished gentleman from Arizona in that chair. It really seems to become him. He may want to reconsider and maybe rejoin his old ranks, but also to say that I hope that the gentleman from Texas will be so generous and make the same offer to me when he returns to the chair later today.

Mr. RHODES (presiding). The Chair directs the Clerk to call the roll of former Members of Congress.

The Clerk called the roll of former Members of Congress, and the following former Members answered to their names:

ROLLCALL OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS
ATTENDING 15TH ANNUAL SPRING MEETING,
MAY 13, 1985

Hugh Q. Alexander of North Carolina;

William H. Avery of Kansas;
William H. Ayres of Ohio;
Lamar Baker of Tennessee;
Laurie Battle of Alabama;
J. Glenn Beall, Jr. of Maryland;
John Blatnik of Minnesota;
John Buchanan of Alabama;
J. Caleb Boggs of Delaware;
David R. Bowen of Mississippi;
Daniel B. Brewster of Maryland;
Charles B. Brownson of Indiana;
William T. Cahill of New Jersey;
Elford A. Cederberg of Michigan;
Charles E. Chamberlain of Michigan;

Don Clausen of California;
James C. Cleveland of New Hampshire;

Jeffery Cohelan of California;
Albert M. Cole of Kansas;
W. Sterling Cole of New York;
David Cornwell of Indiana;
James Coyne of Pennsylvania;
William C. Cramer of Florida;
Paul W. Cronin of Massachusetts;
David Dennis of Indiana;
William Jennings Bryan Dorn of South Carolina;

Michael A. Feighan of Ohio;
L. H. Fountain of North Carolina;
J. Allen Frear, Jr. of Delaware;
J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas;
Edward A. Garmatz of Maryland;
Harlan Hagen of California;
Robert P. Hanrahan of Illinois;
James Harvey of Michigan;
Wayne L. Hays of Ohio;
Jack Hightower of Texas;
Chet Holifield of California;
A. Oakley Hunter of California;
Roman L. Hurska of Nebraska;
August E. Johansen of Michigan;
Jed Johnson, Jr. of Oklahoma;
Walter H. Judd of Minnesota;
Horace R. Kornegay of North Carolina;

Theodore R. Kupferman of New York;

John V. Lindsay of New York;
Robert McClory of Illinois;
Ray J. Madden of Indiana;
George Meader of Michigan;
D. Bailey Merrill of Indiana;
John S. Monagan of Connecticut;
William S. Moorhead of Pennsylvania;

Thomas E. Morgan of Pennsylvania;
Frank E. Moss of Utah;
F. Jay Nimitz of Indiana;
Alvin E. O'Konski of Wisconsin;
Shirley N. Pettis of California;
James M. Quigley of Pennsylvania;
Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin;
John J. Rhodes of Arizona;
J. Kenneth Robinson of Virginia;
John M. Robison, Jr. of Kentucky;
J. Edward Roush of Indiana;
John Roussetot of California;
Fred D. Schwengel of Iowa;
William L. Scott of Virginia;

Armistead Selden of Alabama;
Carlton R. Sickles of Maryland;
Alfred Sieminski of New Jersey;
Henry P. Smith III of New York;
William L. Springer of Illinois;
Lynn Stalbaum of Wisconsin;
Roy A. Taylor of North Carolina;
John H. Terry of New York;
Herbert Tenzer of New York;
Charles A. Vanik of Ohio;
Charles W. Whalen, Jr. of Ohio;
Larry Winn, Jr. of Kansas;
Ralph W. Yarborough of Texas.

□ 1120

Mr. RHODES (presiding). The Chair would like to invite those former Members who did not respond when the roll was called, or whose names were not called, to go give their names to the reading clerk so that they may be included in the roll.

The Chair wishes to thank the other former Members of the House for their presence here today.

The Chair now recognizes the distinguished president of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress, the former Senator from Maryland, J. Glenn Beall.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Speaker. I must say that the gentleman looks very natural in the chair.

Mr. Speaker, former Members of the Congress and sitting Members of the Congress, we are genuinely pleased to be back in the Capitol today, and we are highly honored that the majority leader, Mr. WRIGHT, and the minority whip, Mr. LOTT, and the Members who are on the floor this morning are sharing this occasion with us.

We are grateful to you Mr. Speaker, and to the minority leader, Congressman Bob MICHEL, for arranging this visit so that we can present, in person, the annual report to the Congress required by our Federal charter.

As you know, the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress is a non-profit, educational, research, and social organization. Launched 15 years ago by cofounders, Dr. Walter H. Judd, who is here with us today, and the late Brooks Hays, the membership is now more than 600. Each Member has served in either the U.S. Senate or the House of Representatives, and some have served in both.

When Congress granted a Federal charter to the association, it gave official approval to our purpose. Our main reason for being is to promote the cause of representative government by improving public understanding of the Congress, as an institution, and of democracy as a system of public life.

The association is bipartisan. We select one-half of our Board of Directors from Republican members and one-half from Democratic members. We also balance our officers in the same way and between the 500 former

House Members and the 100 former Senators who form the association.

We come from many places throughout the country. A good number of us are now active in business, professional, or other pursuits, but we continue to have one interest in common: The pursuit of ways to be of service to the institutions of a free society.

Let me assure the current Members of Congress that our association has not come back to Capitol Hill today on a recruiting mission. We wish you as long an active legislative life as you desire. But we promise, Mr. Speaker, to give a warm welcome and to provide opportunities for service on behalf of our country to any Member of Congress who chooses to join us in the future. For those who, like yourself, have announced or are contemplating retirement, we are ready to receive you with rewarding friendships and useful activities.

It is on those activities that I wish to report to you at this time. With encouragement from you and the chairmen of the two foreign policy committees, we have expanded our activities to include a liaison service in this country for members of foreign parliaments and other foreign dignitaries who visit the United States. This new service of the association, as combined protocol and surrogate host, is being funded by a 2-year grant of \$135,250 from the Ford Foundation. We hope that the endeavor is the basis for lightening the burden of protocol on those who are already overburdened. At the same time this service makes it possible to extend a warmer welcome and to enhance the utility of visits from the members of legislative bodies of other nations.

I am pleased to report, and I know the Congress will be happy to learn, that our Congressional Fellows Program is growing in scope and content. This program makes available congressional alumni for brief visits to colleges and universities throughout the Nation. It provides both faculties and students with an insider's view, so to speak, of their government, and especially their Congress. Initiated over 6 years ago, the program is being warmly and widely received as an enriching educational experience. Visits have now been completed to 178 campuses in 49 States. These visits have been made possible by support from institutions such as the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, as well as the universities and colleges themselves.

In previous years, our then presidents, Charles E. Chamberlain and Frank E. Moss, reported on the initiation of an international campus fellows program with a grant from the Ford Foundation. We began by bringing four former Parliamentarians—Alan Lee Williams of the United Kingdom, Georg Kahn-Ackermann of the Federal Republic of Germany, former

Minister Alastair Gillespie of Canada and Dr. Jacques Soustelle of France—to participate in seminars at 20 of our colleges from coast to coast. During the present academic year, with support from the Rockefeller Foundation, we have programmed visits for an additional four parliamentarians from other democracies who will meet with American college students, faculty, and townspeople. Visits have been completed by Dr. Celio Borja of Brazil, Peter von der Heydt of Germany, and Karin Hafstad of Norway. A program is being set up for next fall for Harri Holkeri, a former member of the Finnish Parliament. These foreign legislators provide a resource heretofore unknown particularly on many of the smaller American campuses and they contribute to a greater understanding of other countries among students, faculty, and in local communities. On the reverse side of this coin, with financial support from the Exxon Education Foundation, the Japan-U.S. Foundation and other sources, we have also begun to send former Members to foreign campuses. Last year, for example, former Representative Catherine May Bedell and Senator Frank Moss visited a half-dozen campuses in Japan.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a list of the colleges and universities visited by our U.S. Congressional Fellows together with the names of the former members who were fellows at these campuses. I believe it would be of interest to the current Members of Congress, many of whose States and districts are reflected in the list. I am including it for the RECORD and also some of the comments we have received from the campuses as well as a list of the sponsors who have made our work possible.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES VISITED UNDER THE CONGRESSIONAL ALUMNI CAMPUS FELLOWS PROGRAM

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY, STATE, AND FELLOW
 Alaska Pacific University, Alaska, William S. Mailliard (California).
 Albion College, Michigan, David S. King (Utah).
 Albion College, Michigan, Ted Kupferman (New York).
 Albion College, Michigan, Martha Keys (Kansas).
 Alfred University, New York, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
 Arizona State University, Arizona, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
 Arizona State University, Arizona,¹ Jacques Soustelle (France).
 Assumption College, Massachusetts, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
 Atlanta University², Georgia, William Mailliard (California).
 Atlanta University², Georgia, William Hungate (Missouri).
 Auburn University, Alabama, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
 Avila College¹, Kansas, Karin Hafstad (Norway).
 Bainbridge Jr. College, Georgia, Gilbert Gude (Maryland).
 Baylor University, Texas, James Roosevelt (California).

Baylor University¹, Texas, Peter von der Heydt (Germany).
 Bradley University, Illinois, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).
 Brandeis University, Massachusetts, Abner J. Mikva (Illinois).
 Brandeis University, Massachusetts, L. Richardson Preyer (N. Carolina).
 Brenau College, Georgia, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
 Brigham Young University¹, Utah, Jacques Soustelle (France).
 California Poly. State, California, Frank E. Evans (Colorado).
 Cameron University, Oklahoma, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
 Cameron University, Oklahoma, Dick Clark (Iowa).
 Carleton College, Minnesota, William S. Mailliard (California).
 Carroll College, Montana, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
 Chaminade College, Hawaii, Catherine M. Bedell (Washington).
 Chatham College, Pennsylvania, Catherine M. Bedell (Washington).
 Chatham College, Pennsylvania, Martha Keys (Kansas).
 Clarke College,² Georgia, William Hungate (Missouri).
 Colgate University, New York, William S. Mailliard (California).
 College of the Sequoias, California, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
 Colorado State University,¹ Colorado, Alastair Gillespie (Canada).
 Columbia College, South Carolina, Catherine M. Bedell (Washington).
 Columbia College, South Carolina, Martha Keys (Kansas).
 Concordia College, Michigan, Walter H. Moeller (Ohio).
 Connecticut College, Connecticut, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
 Converse College, South Carolina, Jed Johnson, Jr. (Oklahoma).
 Dartmouth College, New Hampshire, John O. Marsh, Jr. (Virginia).
 Dartmouth College, New Hampshire, William S. Mailliard (California).
 Davis & Elkins College, West Virginia, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
 Davis & Elkins College, West Virginia, J. Glenn Beall, Jr. (Maryland).
 Denison University, Ohio, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
 DePauw University, Indiana, Hugh Scott (Pennsylvania).
 Dillard University,¹ Louisiana, Georg Kahn-Ackermann (Germany).
 Doshisha University,³ Japan, Catherine May Bedell (Washington).
 Duke University,¹ North Carolina, Georg Kahn-Ackermann (Germany).
 Eckerd College, Florida, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
 Elmira College, New York, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).
 Friends University, Kansas, Henry P. Smith, III (New York).
 Furman University, South Carolina, Jed Johnson, Jr. (Oklahoma).
 Georgetown University,¹ District of Columbia, Celio Borja (Brazil).
 Grinnell College, Iowa, Neil Staebler (Michigan).
 Guilford College, North Carolina, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
 Gustavus Adolphus College, Minnesota, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).
 Hamilton College, New York, William S. Mailliard (California).
 Hartwick College, New York, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).

- Hiram College, Ohio, Howard H. Callaway (Georgia).
- Hiram College, Ohio, Roman L. Hruska (Nebraska).
- Hope College, Michigan, Walter H. Judd (Minnesota).
- Hope College, Michigan, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
- Hope College, Michigan, Catherine M. Bedell (Washington).
- Idaho State University, Idaho, John R. Schmidhauser (Iowa).
- Indiana State University, Indiana, Gordon Allott (Colorado).
- Indiana Univ. Northwest, Indiana, Neil Staebler (Michigan).
- Indiana Univ. Northwest, Indiana, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
- Jackson State University, Mississippi, Allard K. Lowenstein (New York).
- Johns Hopkins University, Maryland, Hugh Scott (Pennsylvania).
- Johns Hopkins University,¹ District of Columbia, Celio Borja (Brazil).
- Kansai University,² Japan, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
- Kansas-Newman College, Kansas, Henry P. Smith, III (New York).
- Kansas State University, Kansas, Paul N. McCloskey, Jr. (California).
- Keio University,² Japan, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
- King College, Tennessee, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).
- King's College, Pennsylvania, Philip Hayes (Indiana).
- Kirkland College, New York, William S. Mailliard (California).
- Kwansei Gakuin University,³ Japan, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
- LaGrange College, Georgia, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
- Lake Forest College, Illinois, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
- Lindenwood College, Missouri, Gaylord Nelson (Wisconsin).
- Longwood College, Virginia, Paul W. Cronin (Massachusetts).
- Luther College, Iowa, Gilbert Gude (Maryland).
- McNeese University, Louisiana, William S. Mailliard (California).
- Marshall University, West Virginia, John J. Gilligan (Ohio).
- Mary Hardin Baylor, Texas, Brooks Hays (Arkansas).
- Matanuska-Susitna Community College, Alaska, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
- Mesa Community College, Arizona, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
- Miami University-Middletown, Ohio, James Roosevelt (California).
- Miami University-Middletown, Ohio, James W. Symington (Missouri).
- Mid-America Nazarene, Kansas, John Delenbeck (Oregon).
- Millsaps College, Mississippi, Allard K. Lowenstein (New York).
- Montclair State College, New Jersey, Walter H. Judd (Minnesota).
- Montclair State College, New Jersey, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
- Moorehead State University, Kentucky, Dan Kuykendall (Tennessee).
- Morehouse College,² Georgia, William Mailliard (California).
- Morehouse College,² Georgia, William Hungate (Missouri).
- Morris Brown College,² Georgia, William Mailliard (California).
- Morris Brown College,² Georgia, William Hungate (Missouri).
- Mount Vernon College, District of Columbia, Martha Keys (Kansas).
- Murray State University, Kentucky, Brooks Hays (Arkansas).
- Nanzan University,³ Japan, Catherine May Bedell (Washington).
- New York University, New York, George McGovern (S. Dakota).
- Northern Illinois University, Illinois, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
- Northern Kentucky University, Kentucky, Martha Keys (Kansas).
- North Park College,¹ Illinois, Karin Hafstad (Norway).
- Northwestern University, Illinois, Karin Hafstad (Norway).
- Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
- Oregon State University, Oregon, Martha Keys (Kansas).
- Otterbein College, Ohio, James Roosevelt (California).
- Randolph-Macon College, Virginia, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
- Randolph-Macon College, Virginia, Hugh Scott (Pennsylvania).
- Rockhurst College, Kansas, Karin Hafstad (Norway).
- Rose Hulman Institute of Technology, Indiana, Gordon L. Allott (Colorado).
- St. Cloud State University, Minnesota, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).
- St. Lawrence University, New York, Roman L. Pucinski (Illinois).
- St. Mary-of-the-Woods, Indiana, Gordon L. Allott (Colorado).
- St. Mary's College, Indiana, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
- St. Michael's College, Vermont, Walter H. Judd (Minnesota).
- St. Norbert's College, Wisconsin, Martha Keys (Kansas).
- St. Olaf College, Minnesota, William S. Mailliard (California).
- Salem College, North Carolina, Martha Keys (Kansas).
- Sangamon State University, Illinois, Andrew J. Biemiller (Wisconsin).
- Sangamon State University, Illinois, Martha Keys (Kansas).
- Sangamon State University, Illinois, Alan Lee Williams (United Kingdom).
- Sangamon State University,¹ Illinois, Alastair Gillespie (Canada).
- Siena College, New York, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
- Southeast Community College, Kentucky, Donald E. Lukens (Ohio).
- Southern Illinois University, Illinois, John R. Schmidhauser (Iowa).
- Southwestern College, Kansas, Henry P. Smith III (New York).
- Spelman College,² Georgia, William Mailliard (California).
- Spelman College,² Georgia, William Hungate (Missouri).
- SUNY-Binghamton, New York, John B. Anderson (Illinois).
- SUNY-Plattsburg, New York, Richardson Preyer (North Carolina).
- State University of Oswego, New York, Martha Keys (Kansas).
- Syracuse University, New York, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).
- Talladega College, Alabama, Ted Kupferman (New York).
- Tougaloo Southern Christian College, Mississippi, Allard K. Lowenstein (New York).
- Transylvania University, Kentucky, James M. Quigley (Pennsylvania).
- U.S. Air Force Academy,¹ Colorado, Alan Lee Williams (Great Britain).
- U.S. Coast Guard Academy, Connecticut, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
- U.S. Naval Academy, Maryland, John S. Monagan (Connecticut).
- U.S. Naval Academy, Maryland, William S. Mailliard (California).
- U.S. Naval Academy,¹ Maryland, Alan Lee Williams (Great Britain).
- University of Alaska, Alaska, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
- University of Alaska, Alaska, William S. Mailliard (California).
- University of Arizona,¹ Arizona, Celio Borja (Brazil).
- University of Arkansas, Arkansas, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
- University of Arkansas, Arkansas, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
- University of Arkansas, Arkansas, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).
- University of California—Berkeley, California, Henry S. Reuss (Wisconsin).
- University of California—Berkeley, California, Newton I. Steers, Jr. (Maryland).
- University of Delaware, Delaware, John J. Gilligan (Ohio).
- University of Delaware, Delaware, Henry S. Reuss (Wisconsin).
- University of Georgia,¹ Georgia, Georg Kahn-Ackerman (Germany).
- University of Georgia,¹ Georgia, Otis Pike (New York).
- University of Maine—Orono, Maine, John Rhodes (Arizona).
- University of Michigan—Flint, Michigan, Gale McGee (Wyoming).
- University of Nevada, Nevada, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
- University of New Mexico,¹ New Mexico, Alastair Gillespie (Canada).
- University of New Mexico,¹ New Mexico, Celio Borja (Brazil).
- University of New Orleans,¹ Louisiana, Georg Kahn-Ackerman (Germany).
- University of New Orleans,¹ Jacques Soustelle, France (France).
- University of North Dakota, North Dakota, Neil Staebler (Michigan).
- University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma, Catherine M. Bedell (Washington).
- University of Oregon, Oregon, Martha Keys (Kansas).
- University of Redlands, California, Catherine M. Bedell (Washington).
- University of South Carolina,¹ South Carolina, Alan Lee Williams (United Kingdom).
- University of South Carolina, South Carolina, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
- University of South Dakota, South Dakota, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
- University of Texas,¹ Texas, Alastair Gillespie (Canada).
- University of Texas,¹ Texas, Celio Borja (Brazil).
- University of Utah, Utah, Robert N. Glaimo (Connecticut).
- University of Utah,¹ Utah, Jacques Soustelle (France).
- University of Utah,¹ Utah, Alan Lee Williams (United Kingdom).
- University of Washington,¹ Washington, Alan Lee Williams (United Kingdom).
- University of West Virginia,¹ West Virginia, Georg Kahn-Ackerman (Germany).
- University of West Virginia,¹ West Virginia, Jacques Soustelle (France).
- University of Wisconsin,¹ Wisconsin, Georg Kahn-Ackerman (Germany).
- University of Wyoming, Wyoming, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
- Urbana College, Ohio, David S. King (Utah).
- Vanderbilt University, Tennessee, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
- Vanderbilt University, Tennessee, Celio Borja (Brazil).

Virginia Military Institute, Virginia, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

Wake Forest University, North Carolina, William L. Hungate (Missouri).

Wake Forest University,¹ North Carolina, Georg Kahn-Ackerman (Germany).

Washington & Lee University, Virginia, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

Wayne State College, Nebraska, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

Westmont College, California, Ronald A. Sarasin (Connecticut).

Wheaton College, Massachusetts, Charles A. Vanik (Ohio).

Whitman College, Washington, Frank E. Moss (Utah).

William & Mary College, Virginia, Hugh Scott (Pennsylvania).

¹ International project funded by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations for visit of Parliamentarians from the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Canada, Brazil, Norway and Finland.

² These were part of a set of visits to the Atlanta University Consortium.

³ Pilot project funded by Exxon Education Foundation.

SAMPLE COMMENTS ON 1984 CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWS PROGRAM

"We were absolutely delighted with James Symington. We worked him hard, perhaps too hard . . . Comments I have received have all been positive. Faculty members found him well-informed, students found him to be an effective and personable lecturer . . . We look forward to participating in the program next year."—Eugene Bennett, Executive Director, Miami University-Middletown, Middletown, Ohio, March 29, 1984.

"Having Pete McCloskey on our campus was a most enriching experience for us. The faculty and students have all expressed how important and positive his visit was for everyone . . . His insights into the Middle East were also appreciated. He provided a rare opportunity for Kansas State University students to learn and interact with someone with a wide range of political experience."—Naomi B. Lynn, Professor and Head, Department of Political Science, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, April 23, 1984.

"I also want to add my personal commendation for the remarkable leadership which Catherine Bedell gave to this seminar group. The students were overwhelmed with her as a person and impressed with her knowledge of the workings of government, the global issues of trade and international relations, the role of corporations nationally and internationally, the domestic issues such as gender bias. She gave herself to the group totally, and they exploited her intellectually and personally with endless questions and discussion."—Mrs. Audrey E. Maehl, Associate Director, Scholar-Leadership Enrichment Program, The University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, May 9, 1984.

"I should like to express the appreciation of the various academic programs of the University of Alaska, Anchorage for Judge Hungate's stimulating exchanges with students and faculty during his visit as a Congressional Fellow last month. The opportunity to listen to and talk with a legislator of his deep experience gave life to the processes of the U.S. Congress, the judicial system, and political life in general."—Dr. John A. Brownell, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Alaska, Anchorage, Alaska, May 17, 1984.

"Martha Keys, our first 'Politician-In-Residence' at St. Norbert College, was largely

responsible for our program being so very successful in its first year. She also participated in our Model Congressional session which we sponsor for Wisconsin high school students. Her in-depth knowledge on some of the significant issues of the day, warm personality, rapport with students and faculty and general professionalism were the key ingredients for success during her visit."—Dr. David G. Wegge, Assistant Professor of Political Science, St. Norbert College, DePere, Wisconsin, May 24, 1984.

"We had an excellent visit from Mr. John Rhodes last week on this campus . . . Feedback from the visit has been very favorable from both faculty and students. Mr. Rhodes provided us with new and important insights on national politics, especially the Congress. We really had an enjoyable time, and we hope he did, too."—Kenneth T. Palmer, Interim Chair, University of Maine at Orono, Orono, Maine, October 1, 1984.

"Students, faculty and staff enjoyed and learned from Gale McGee's visit, and join in sending thanks to you and him . . . It was very useful. He captivated the class and held their interest. I heard students discussing his talks afterwards. His synopsis of 50 years of American foreign policy was very helpful to students. We should definitely invite another former Member of Congress lecturer."—Douglas Kelley, Assistant to the Provost, the University of Michigan-Flint, Flint, Michigan, October 18, 1984.

Together with the Atlantic Council, the association has sponsored a bipartisan study of the Nation's foreign policy machinery. Former Senator and Secretary of State, Edmund S. Muskie has served with Ambassador Kenneth Rush as cochairman of the study. A bipartisan group of our Members joined with former Secretaries of State and other former executive branch officials, and prominent scholars in government affairs to undertake this non-partisan examination. The results of the study which was codirected by Frank Valeo, former Secretary of the Senate and the late Dr. Francis O. Wilcox, with Kenneth Thompson as rapporteur, have just been published in a 20,000 word report. Copies of the report and recommendations will be made available shortly to the executive branch, the Congress, and the public.

The association's participation in the study was made possible by grants from the Ford Foundation, the Lilly Endowment and other sources.

A comparative study of the German Bundestag and the U.S. Congress described in our earlier reports to this body is now nearing completion. The concluding conference will be held at Wingspread, the Johnson Foundation Conference Center near Racine, WI, in September of this year. The final work will be published in the languages of both countries, as was done with our widely distributed comparative study of the Japanese Diet and the U.S. Congress several years ago. This project has been supported by funding from many sources including the German Ministry of Research and Technology, the U.S. National Endow-

ment for the Humanities, and the Friedrich Naumann Foundation of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Our international activity has increased very rapidly, with requests coming from both governmental and private institutions here and abroad to conduct studies or to help facilitate exchanges. Many of these relate to successor generation legislators in numerous countries and involve young government leaders. In short, Mr. Speaker, the association is now an instrument for the transmission of knowledge and democratic values, not only to young people on campuses and elsewhere in our own country and abroad, but also to younger legislators and other political leaders around the world. I might note, too, that the association has begun to establish liaison with counterparts in other countries. Our interaction with them is developing very fruitfully. The Italian and German associations, for example, are now part of a network of seven such associations in Western Europe, including Austria, Belgium, France, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

Following visits to Brazil during this past year by Bob Griffin of Michigan, Bill Mailliard of California, Gale McGee of Wyoming, and Frank Moss of Utah, a Brazilian former parliamentarians association was formed with several hundred members and is beginning its work from offices in their National Congress Building. And a resurgent association is now becoming active again in Argentina opening the possibility of an early formation of a Latin American network of such associations. At this moment, our colleagues Bill Mailliard and Gale McGee, both former Ambassadors to the Organization of American States, are in South America where they have been in contact with the Brazilian and Argentine associations and are meeting with current legislative leaders to help develop programs which will strengthen the restored democracies in those countries and in Uruguay.

Last month it was my pleasure to chair our third annual conference in Salzburg, Austria, between a bipartisan delegation of young Members of the U.S. Congress and a delegation of young members of the German Bundestag representing all the parties in that body. The subject was "Domestic and International Economic Policy Issues." To date, 28 current Members of the Congress have taken part in these conferences which are supported by the German Marshall Fund of the United States, among others. In commenting on the experience, one of the young Members of Congress has written:

The entire occasion was very educational and has given me a much better understanding of many of the mutual concerns of West Germany and the United States, as well as

an understanding of the German parliamentary system.

I can assure you that the benefit for Bundestag members has been just as great.

This year, Mr. Speaker, we hosted 20 young German political activists, some of whom may become future members of the German Bundestag. In a program sponsored by the Presidential Youth Exchange Commission, we gave these young Germans a unique and extremely valuable exposure to the American political process. During the month before the election of 1984, they spent one-half their time observing the closely fought Senate race in the State of Illinois. Following this, they witnessed congressional contests in Missouri, Indiana, and Wisconsin.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, to bring this report to a close, I should like to call your attention to a number of colleagues, most of whom were known to you, who have passed away since our last meeting in this Chamber. They served their country in their time and they will be sorely missed. And I would like to read the list of our departed colleagues at this time.

E. Ross Adair, Indiana; George D. Aiken, Vermont; Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; Howard M. Baldrige, Nebraska; J.H. Bottum, South Dakota; James A. Burke, Massachusetts; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin; Louis J. Capozzoli, New York; Frank L. Chelf, Sr., Kentucky; Earle C. Clements, Kentucky; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; Sam J. Ervin, Jr., North Carolina; Edwin D. Eshleman, Pennsylvania; Melvin H. Evans, Virgin Islands; Elizabeth P. Farrington, Hawaii; Homer Ferguson, Michigan; George A. Goodling, Pennsylvania; George M. Grant, Alabama; P.W. Griffiths, Ohio; Cecil M. Harden, Indiana; James C. Healey, New York; Louis B. Heller, New York; Frank E. Hook, Michigan; Craig Hosmer, California; Glen D. Johnson, Oklahoma; A. Paul Kitchin, North Carolina; Henry Cabot Lodge, Massachusetts; J. Carlton Loser, Tennessee; Ernest W. McFarland, Arizona; Martin B. McKneally, New York; William H. Meyer, Vermont; George P. Miller, California; Charles A. Mosher, Ohio; Ralph J. Scott, North Carolina; Keith G. Sebelius, Kansas; Tom Steed, Oklahoma; Katherine St. George, New York; Glen H. Taylor, Idaho; William M. Tuck, Virginia; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; Charles H. Wilson, California; Chase Going Woodhouse, Connecticut; Milton R. Young, North Dakota; and Stephen M. Young, Ohio.

I would suggest that we now have a moment of silence in memory of these departed brethren, Mr. Speaker.

[A moment of silence was observed for departed Members.]

It is time now to make a very special presentation. Each year, the associa-

tion's board of directors selects a person who exemplifies the spirit of the Congress and honors that person for a distinguished contribution to the Nation through service in the Congress. These awards are alternated between the parties and it is testimony to the vitality of our system that each of our parties provides many outstanding persons whose service can be regarded, readily, as worthy of such recognition. In today's presentation, it falls to me to honor a member of the other party. I do so with the deepest personal pleasure. We were colleagues in the Senate and I might add that our honoree came to the House in the same class with my father in 1943.

Much of his service in the Senate involved the Nation's relations with other countries. Even before the end of World War II, he sensed the great need for a durable peace and lent his energy and intellectual richness to the building of international institutions and activities which might contribute to that end. His name attaches to a great pioneering program of international exchange. Under that program, thousands of American scholars have gone abroad and have brought back, to share with the Nation, a deepened understanding of other cultures, their achievements in the arts and sciences and other human pursuits. And out of that gathered experience has come an enrichment of the life of this Nation. Similarly, foreigners have come to this country, learned about our strengths and shortcomings, our achievements and hopes. From this exchange program, in short, has come a continuing contribution to mutual enlightenment, tolerance and respect between ourselves and other nations, which, in the end, resides the hope for durable peace.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, he made that body a source of profound consideration of the great issues of foreign policy which confronted the Nation during the Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Ford administrations, from the Cuban missile crisis to the war in Vietnam.

Yet for all of his concern with the Nation's survival and progress in a changing world, he never forgot his roots, his deep ties to the people. To a State which has had more than its share of deprivation and impoverishment, he brought a strong conviction of the power of education to change things for the better. By the same token, he brought his background as an educator into his long service in the Senate and helped us all to understand more clearly what confronted the Nation in an uncertain and changing world.

Mr. Speaker, and members of the Association of Former Members of Congress, and Members of Congress, it is a great honor and a great privilege

to present the Association's 1985 Distinguished Service Award to Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, J. William Fulbright.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, and former Members and Members, this is a very unexpected, I mean, unexpected 2 or 3 weeks ago, honor for me. All the time I was in the Congress I do not believe I ever heard such a nice speech made about me.

I am a little nervous, you know, when he kept calling that roll I kept wondering whether my name was going to be on it; those who had departed. Because I am getting a little old, too, as you probably may have heard. My poor wife, the one thing I regret about this day, it is a wonderful day for me, is that she is too ill to be here or to participate in it.

As I recall, the names which have been mentioned here, and as I see some of them here, naturally makes me want to reminisce, it was 42 years ago that I came to this House. I came very green; I had never served in the legislative bodies of my State. I had been a professor and an administrator at the university, et cetera, and it was a new experience, and I must say that I was overcome with curiosity and elation and excitement. It was a wonderful cultural shock to me coming from Fayetteville, AR, which was a rather small town at that time; it still is rather small. I had never been out of Arkansas until I had a scholarship abroad. So I knew very little until I came back.

It was a wonderful experience; that first year, when I was introduced to the various Members. In those days, we were told that it is better to be seen and not heard, and you were not supposed to make much noise.

I remember Clare Booth Luce, who came in the same time I did with a great reputation, and a very glamorous and attractive woman. She made a speech, a very violent speech, we thought, Democrats did, attacking Henry Wallace. I forget what it was, but she coined the word "globaloney"; it made a great impression.

I was talking to one of the senior Members, Luther Johnson from Texas, and I said, I thought that somebody ought to respond. I said, a senior Member, it was beneath his dignity to respond. Maybe as a freshman Member, because she had just come in the same day I had, it would be appropriate for me to respond. He said, "That is a good idea." So he encouraged me. I did respond; and, of course, she took me up right away on the misuse of the word "infer" as opposed to "imply." It demolished my speech because I did not use the language properly.

That made the headlines in Time magazine, which, as you know, was published by her husband. So I never did get a very good shake out of Time magazine from then on. But it was a great introduction, and mention was made of that by Jim of the short resolution. That was the first resolution I introduced.

I had been assigned to Foreign Affairs; in those days, it was that everybody recognized that was a very risky assignment. That is the last thing you want to get on if you want to stay in Congress.

Wilbur Mills was here then, and many of you served with him. He is still around. He was on Ways and Means and he had a good deal to do and, of course, I could not get on Appropriations or Ways and Means or Agriculture. He said, "You can get on Foreign Affairs; nobody wants to be on that because you do not last very long if you stay paying attention to foreign affairs."

Anyway, I took it, and out of that, those hearings were on lend-lease. I hope you will not mind if I reminisce a bit but many of you have forgotten about lend-lease. That was a big issue, and it was a lot of money, we thought, in those days.

I asked the question, and I did not get to ask a question very often because the time ran out in our hearings, Sol Bloom from New York was chairman, and he did not think freshmen ought to take up much of the time of the committee, either, but I asked him, "What are we going to get out of lend-lease?" and they could not say very well. They did not expect it to be repaid because after World War I it had not been. Those were war debts.

Anyway, that idea sort of prompted me to try that little resolution, which was adopted. Speaker Rayburn was very sympathetic. I must say, I never could be very partisan because Jim Wadsworth from New York, and Doc Eaton from New Jersey, both Republicans, they were the senior Republican Members, and Frances Bolton from Ohio. Some of you may remember Frances. She was an outstanding woman. They encouraged me. Sol Bloom, the chairman, thought it was presumptuous of a young freshman Congressman from Arkansas to offer any amendment, but Jim Wadsworth, it sort of tickled him. He was from New York, too. He had been a Senator, if you all remember, and he was defeated. He was one of the few examples like that, like CLAUDE PEPPER. By the way, CLAUDE PEPPER was my professor back in the 1920's. I will bet none of you knew that and CLAUDE is older than I am, I guess. He is the only one I can think of who is, around here. But I had a law class with CLAUDE PEPPER. Think of that. Good Lord, that is 60 years ago.

Jim Wadsworth and Doc Eaton both encouraged me. I think Jim did it because he wanted to devil old Sol Bloom, who was from New York City and was chairman, as usual. The House was Democratic then, as it still is, and Sol Bloom was not very popular with the Republican Members, as I assume they never are. But anyway, those two men helped me very much. They took sort of an interest in this young freshman and helped me. Of course, at that time there were a lot of people you may know. You have already mentioned Brooks Hays and Walter Judd, the two founders of this body. I may say that in those early days, I think at that time I took out a life membership. When I look back on it, I did not know I was going to live so long and it was a good investment. I advise all of you to take out a life membership. It is better than any other investment you can make. But it worked out very well.

Rayburn was very friendly. They all were. It was better than going to a college fraternity. It seemed to me they all wanted to be helpful in a constructive way, and I enjoyed it no end.

Mr. Speaker, I made a speech which I am not going to bore you with, but I would ask your indulgence to take excerpts from it, about Congress, one of the first public speeches I made away from this body, at the University of Chicago. I will include as part of my speech just three or four paragraphs for the RECORD, but I do not want to read it because it only tells you how good you are and important this House is, which I still think, but what I find remarkable about it is how early in my career in the Congress did I recognize how important the Congress is.

The speech excerpts follow:

The legislator is an indispensable guardian of our freedom. It is true that great executives have played a powerful role in the development of civilization, but such leaders appear sporadically, by chance. They do not always appear when they are most needed. The great executives have given inspiration and push to the advancement of human society, but it is the legislator who has given stability and continuity to that slow and painful progress.

The legislator may not often give us the inspired leadership which is necessary in the crises of human affairs, but he does institutionalize, in the form of law, those measures which mark the slow lifting of mankind up from the rule of tooth and claw. Like the stop on a jack, the legislator may not elevate our civilization, but he does prevent our slipping back into the tyranny of rule by brute force. Many Americans are impatient at the lack of vision and initiative of the Congress, but they should not forget that it is the Congress that stands between their liberties and the voracious instinct for power of the executive bureaucracy.

An important responsibility of the legislature is to provide a check upon the tendency of the executive power of the state to become arbitrary and oppressive. It is not a mere coincidence that Hitler and Mussolini had the greatest contempt for legislatures

and politicians. I am not sure that Stalin has a profound respect for his legislature. The legislature elected by the people is an indispensable adjunct of any system of self-government in which the freedom and integrity of the individual are of paramount concern. A state may become powerful under a dictatorship, but the people are oppressed. A properly functioning legislative body restrains the arbitrary power of the state. It permits the development of a climate in which the genius of individual human beings can flourish. For short periods in history, benevolent monarchs have fostered the arts and the humanities in small areas of the world, but invariably the power of the state falls into incompetent or tyrannical hands, and civilization disintegrates. With an effective legislature, there is a continuity of policy, which may not always be as enlightened as we might wish it to be, but it is never so oppressive as the naked executive power usually becomes.

When you read the polls today, the way they rate who is doing a good job as between the executive and the Congress, it sort of distresses me so much how ignorant our populace is, or whoever it is who answers those polls, because there is no comparison in the approval rate between the executive and the Congress, which is just exactly wrong if we wish to preserve a democratic system.

So I rather like that speech because it emphasized that. I made it within 2 or 3 years after I came into the Congress. So I think it would be appropriate if it could be included. The main thrust of it is, it really is the Congress, and the House of Representatives especially, and the Senate, that here we have them both, to provide stability and continuity to our Government. If we are really interested in preserving freedom, as we say we are, those are the most important bodies because they institutionalize in the form of laws the protections of our liberties and freedom.

Throughout history, the executives, and not just here, I mean in all countries, have tended, if there is oppression, it originates with the efforts of the executive to impose their will. So apparently the American people, at least those who respond to polls, do not recognize quite the significance that the institution of the Congress plays. They ought to be educated.

Unfortunately, television does not lend itself as well to the representation of a body of 535 Members as it does to the individual. Television seems to personalize everything and it is difficult for a House of this body or the Senate or together to use it. I introduced legislation that never got anywhere in the Senate, to provide for equal time for the Congress, the executive, the President, that whenever he takes 30 minutes of prime time, or whatever he takes, the Congress would be entitled to it. They got in a wrangle in the hearings, who is going to provide it, and so on, and I said, "Well, leave that up to the body. They work

out their differences in conferences on other very controversial issues. Why could they not do it in this if you give them the opportunity and the incentive to do it? I think they could."

But anyway, all the television people, of course, opposed it. They had a lot of influence with the Members, and it did not get anywhere. I still think it is a good idea. I think some spokesman of the Congress ought to be able to use the same amount of free public prime time as the President does to keep the balance between the two. I am not trying to abolish the executive, but I just think that because of the appeal of television, it is tending to get out of balance more than it used to be.

But I think the Congress really has, out of all these Members here, you all know them, a greater diversity and I think originality, and many of the best ideas originate in the Congress. They have in the past and they will in the future, and its importance ought to be significantly increased and the people ought to be made to recognize how important it is. I know that what they tend to do is—obviously they approve of their own Congressman—but they tend to make a difference between the way they respect their own Congressmen and Representatives and the body as a whole. Why this is true I am not quite sure. It is not clear to me other than I have tried to think about it with regard to television.

But I have seen these polls that give the rating of Congress way down, which is really very distressing.

I do not wish to take too much time. I forget about the 5-minute rule, but I want to just mention and emphasize a little further one of the things that Glenn Beall, one of my old friends, mentioned, because the legislation originated in the Congress. The executive did not even know about it when it was introduced in the Senate on the exchange program, and the preservation of it has entirely been provided by the Congress.

Two or three times there have been efforts made either to reduce it, eliminate it, or to politicize it, and the Congress has come to the rescue. Even within the last 5 years there was a suggestion made from the executive to reduce the amount by about 50 percent. It was the Congress, the House and the Senate, who preserved it and who have, in fact, increased it.

I just want to emphasize that when you think of the amount of money that is being spent for our security, as they call it, the arms race, some \$300 billion, and compare it with the cost of this program, which has been going now for nearly 40 years. It was introduced 40 years ago this year, the legislation was. It did not actually get into operation because there were various administrative tangles and questions that had to be resolved. So the first

students who went away were assigned to China, which was the first government we made the agreement with. This was before the revolution, before we broke relations in 1949.

But during that period there was roughly, in round numbers, 150,000 to 200,000, depending on certain marginal cases there, but approximately 50,000 Americans and 100,000 foreigners. The total cost of that program since the beginning, and I do not know how you evaluate the original funds because they were all IOU's growing out of the sale of surplus war property.

□ 1150

So they were not convertible into dollars, and the experience of the First World War is that they were forgiven, the First World War debts. So I do not know how you evaluate them. If you give them a value of approximately what they were, still the total cost in the nearly 40 years would not buy one submarine, maybe about a half of a submarine.

When you are thinking of your security alone, forgetting for a moment the intellectual aspects, the professors, and so on, in these countries that are important in international security, our former allies and our former enemies, you have some of the very important and coming influential citizens. In their governments you will find them, and especially in their universities and in journalism, in any walk of life, because just now, after 30 years, they are beginning to arrive at what you call midcareer where they are influential, just as Members of this body are. There are some Members in this body, and you will find it the same in all the countries of Western Europe, and especially Japan. And the interesting thing is that the two principal enemies in the last world war of 40 years ago, the Germans and the Japanese, are the two principal supporters outside of the United States.

This has made a great impression on both of them, and I think it is more than a coincidence that it is these two countries. If you recall, the Germans in the First World War were monsters. Many of you will maybe not remember that, but in the publicity, although we did not have television, they were the Huns who devoured babies for breakfast. I mean they were real monsters, we thought. And in the Second World War, we thought the same, even more maybe, of the Japanese, these people who had no respect for life, with their kamikaze pilots and Pearl Harbor, et cetera. You know what we thought about them.

These two countries now—and I think this program has had much to do with it—are the principal supporters. Two years ago, I believe it was, the Germans gave about three times as much for the Fulbright program in

Germany as we did. The Japanese Government equally matches it, plus private donations are considerably more than here. As a matter of fact, 29 of the foreign countries now contribute their own funds to supplement and support what we give. It is almost as much as we give overall, not quite. But it keeps the program multinational, and it shows their interest in it and the people that have influence. There are friendly people in positions of influence.

I submit, purely on the matter of security, if you like, it is much more helpful to the country to have a hundred thousand understanding friends than it is to continue to pile up more and more armaments. But that is a very controversial issue, and I know it. I am only mentioning it, not trying to make it an issue this morning but to consider it, because people tend to consider this type of program purely from the educational aspects. It is not that we are against education, we are all for it. But it has implications—as Miss Luce will agree, whether it is an implication or an inference, one or the other—for much greater profit and much greater benefit for the amount invested in it than anything you can mention. But we have not put really very much money in it. So I think that it goes to the root of the problem.

Lord Grace said after World War I that "the great nations are always making mistakes because they don't understand each other's psychology." And that is true. We thought the Germans were monsters; now they are friends. The President has just been there. We thought the Japanese were monsters; now they are friends. Now we are presently engaged in this same relationship with the Russians. They could be dangerous. We think they are monsters, and our television and our journalists whip it up and they get worse every day. It feeds upon itself. It is the nature of this kind of an animosity that develops.

I maintain that there is no good end to that type of approach or activity. Whatever you may think of them today, you do not want to have a nuclear exchange. We all agree on that. What do you do about it? I am only suggesting that one of the things you do is to understand them and they understand us, to learn to know their psychology and they will understand ours, and there may be a basis upon which you can have some agreement.

So it is that Congress that deserves the credit for this type of approach. As Glenn Beall has said, the former Members are doing the same thing in a little different context. The only thing is they are approaching it from the nonacademic aspect, in the non-academic field, but they are seeking to accomplish—and I think they are—the same thing.

Well, I have taken more time than I used to get in the House. I took advantage of your allowing me to reminisce. I only want to say again how much I appreciate it. It really is an unexpected pleasure because I have been out now for quite a long time and I thought people had forgotten all about it. But I am deeply indebted to the former Members for this honor. It is the greatest honor I have had because it comes from our peers.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you much, the former Members.

[Applause, the former Members rising.]

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, to show that he truly is remembered, I would like to add to Senator Fulbright's collection a collection of letters from sitting and former Members of Congress showing their respect and admiration. [Applause.]

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, one final item will conclude this 1985 report to the Congress by the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress. And that is to announce the transfer of the leadership of our association, as is our practice every year. Former Congressman James M. Quigley of Pennsylvania, will officially take office in July and be our leader for the next 12 months. I can assure him—as he must already know—that he will have the support of all the members of our association.

I am sure that it will be a fulfilling and enriching experience for him. I might say that he will also have the assistance of a skilled and devoted staff, including our executive director, Jed Johnson, Jr., himself a former Member of Congress, our faithful secretary-manager, Dorothy Bageant, staff assistant Leslie Weaver, and Judy Allen, as well as Deputy Director George Agree and consultants, Francis Valeo, and Gerald Livingston.

Mr. Speaker, I have one other thing, a housekeeping announcement. I should remind the members of the association that after we leave here, we will move to the ninth floor of the Hart Building, which will be a new experience, I am sure, for a lot of us because it is the latest addition to the Senate side of the Capitol. We will have lunch on the ninth floor of that building at 12:30, and we will hear from the majority leader of the Senate, Senator ROBERT DOLE of Kansas.

I would point out also that for this afternoon's program, which is foreign policy briefings led by counselor and former Member Ed Derwinski, the room has been changed. If you do not have a new green sheet, you should make note of the fact that this meeting beginning at 2 o'clock will be held in room 106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. Otherwise everything remains the same.

We will also have our reception this evening from 5:30 to 7:00, again on the ninth floor of the Hart Senate Office Building. So we will meet again at 12:30 at the Hart Senate Office Building for our lunch.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes our annual report to the Congress. We thank you and every Member of both bodies. The welfare of our country and, in a large degree, of the world is in your hands. We support you in the faithful discharge of your responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by inserting in the RECORD a list of those sponsors who make our programs possible.

SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTORS TO THE ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

PATRONS¹

1. Ford Foundation.
2. German Marshall Fund of the United States.
3. Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission.
4. Lilly Endowment, Inc.
5. Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.
6. National Endowment for the Humanities.
7. Rockefeller Foundation.
8. U.S. Information Agency.
15. Anonymous Individual.
10. Anonymous Foundation.
11. Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation.
12. Carnegie Corporation of New York.
13. Carnegie Corporation—Aging Society Project.¹
14. Exxon Education Foundation.
15. FMC Corporation Foundation.
16. Honorable Charles K. Fletcher.
17. FMC Auxiliary.
18. Grand Street Boys' Foundation.
19. Flora & William Hewlett Foundation.
20. John Crain Kunkel Foundation.
21. Honorable William S. Mailliard.
22. Louis Taft Semple Foundation.
23. University of South Carolina—James Byrnes International Center.
24. United Parcel Service Foundation.
25. Mr. Francis R. Valeo.

BENEFACTORS²

15. Anonymous Individual.
10. Anonymous Foundation.
11. Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation.
12. Carnegie Corporation of New York.
13. Carnegie Corporation—Aging Society Project.¹
14. Exxon Education Foundation.
15. FMC Corporation Foundation.
16. Honorable Charles K. Fletcher.
17. FMC Auxiliary.
18. Grand Street Boys' Foundation.
19. Flora & William Hewlett Foundation.
20. John Crain Kunkel Foundation.
21. Honorable William S. Mailliard.
22. Louis Taft Semple Foundation.
23. University of South Carolina—James Byrnes International Center.
24. United Parcel Service Foundation.
25. Mr. Francis R. Valeo.

SPONSORS³

26. AT&T Foundation.
27. Albion College.
28. AMAX Foundation.
29. America-Israel Friendship League.
30. American Brands, Inc.
31. American Income Life Insurance Company.
32. Ashland Oil Company.
33. Atlantic Council of the United States.
34. Baltimore Gas & Electric Company.
35. Battelle Memorial Institute.
36. Baylor University.
37. Honorable J. Glenn Beall, Jr.
38. Beech Aircraft Corporation.
39. Black & Decker Manufacturing Company.
40. Honorable Iris F. Blitch.
41. Honorable J. Caleb Boggs.
42. Honorable Charles B. Brownson.
43. Honorable Joel T. Broyhill.
44. Honorable James L. Buckley.
45. Howard H. Callaway Foundation.
46. Castle & Cooke, Inc.

¹ Patrons have contributed at least \$50,000.

² Benefactors have contributed between \$10,000 and \$50,000.

³ Sponsors have contributed \$1,000 to \$10,000.

47. Honorable Elford A. Cederberg.
48. Honorable Charles E. Chamberlain.
49. Champion International Corporation.
50. Honorable & Mrs. Jeffery Cohelan.
51. Honorable W. Sterling Cole.
52. Congressional Staff Directory, Ltd.
53. Mr. Ralph J. Cornell.
54. Coyne Chemical.
55. Delphi Research Associates.
56. Ernst & Paula Deutsch Foundation, Inc.
57. Exxon Company, USA.
58. Federal National Mortgage Association.
59. Finance Factors Foundation.
60. Gerald R. Ford Foundation.
61. Ford Motor Company Fund.
62. Honorable David H. Gambrell.
63. General Electric Foundation.
64. Honorable Robert A. Grant.
65. Gulf Oil Corporation.
66. Richard T. Hanna Family Fund.
67. Honorable Ralph R. Harding.
68. Honorable Porter Hardy, Jr.
69. Hartwick College.
70. Honorable Brooks Hays.
71. H. J. Heinz Charitable Trust.
72. Honorable Jeffrey P. Hillelson.
73. Home Federal Savings & Loan Association.
74. Honorable Roman L. Hruska.
75. Honorable William L. Hungate.
76. Honorable J. Edward Hutchinson.
77. I.B.M.
78. Institute of International Education.
79. International Harvester.
80. International Union of Operating Engineers.
81. Mrs. Benjamin F. James.
82. The Johnson Foundation.
83. Honorable Jed Johnson, Jr.
84. Honorable Walter H. Judd.
85. Honorable William J. Keating.
86. Kemper Educational and Charitable Fund.
87. Mr. J. C. Kennedy.
88. Lincoln Memorial Park, Inc.
89. Luther College.
90. Honorable Gales W. McGee.
91. Honorable James G. Martin.
92. Matanuska-Susitna Community College.
93. Honorable D. Bailey Merrill.
94. Honorable Helen S. Meyner.
95. Miami University—Ohio.
96. Mid-America Nazarene College.
97. Honorable Chester L. Mize.
98. Mobil Oil Corporation.
99. Honorable John S. Monagan.
100. Honorable Frank E. Moss.
101. Mount Vernon College.
102. Mr. Richard Murphy.
103. National Association of Independent Insurers.
104. National Paint & Coatings Association.
105. National Study Commission on Records and Documents.
106. Pacific Federal Savings & Loan Association.
107. Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company.
108. Pan Pacific Community Association.
109. Honorable Shirley N. Pettis.
110. Honorable Otis Pike.
111. Pioneer Federal Savings & Loan Association.
112. The Prudential Foundation.
113. Honorable James M. Quigley.
114. Honorable Ben Reifel.
115. Relief Foundation, Inc.
116. Honorable Henry S. Reuss.
117. R. J. Reynolds Company.
118. Reynolds Metals Company.

- 119. Honorable John J. Rhodes.
- 120. Honorable Fred B. Rooney.
- 121. Salem College.
- 122. Sangamon State University.
- 123. Dr. Scholl Foundation.
- 124. Florence & John Schumann Foundation.
- 125. Honorable Hugh Scott.
- 126. Honorable William L. Scott.
- 127. G. D. Searle & Company.
- 128. Sears Roebuck and Company.
- 129. Mrs. Kay Sheppard.
- 130. Honorable Carlton R. Sickles.
- 131. Siena College.
- 132. Honorable Henry P. Smith III.
- 133. SmithKline Corporation.
- 134. Sperry Corporation.
- 135. Honorable William L. Springer.
- 136. St. Cloud University.
- 137. Sun Company.
- 138. SUNY—Binghamton University.
- 139. Honorable James W. Symington.
- 140. TRW, Inc.
- 141. Florrie & Herbert Tenzer Philanthropic Fund.
- 142. Honorable Herbert Tenzer.
- 143. Honorable Lera Thomas.
- 144. The Tobacco Institute.
- 145. Honorable Andrew J. Transue.
- 146. Unilever United States, Inc.
- 147. U.S. Capitol Historical Society.
- 148. United States-Japan Foundation.
- 149. University of Alaska.
- 150. University of California—Berkeley.
- 151. University of Delaware.
- 152. University of Oklahoma Foundation.
- 153. University of Utah.
- 154. Honorable Victor V. Veysey.
- 155. Whalley Charitable Trust.
- 156. Mr. & Mrs. James Yao.
- 157. Honorable Ralph W. Yarborough.
- 158. Honorable Samuel H. Young.

Mr. RHODES (presiding). I thank the gentleman from Maryland. On behalf of the association and its members, I want to express the appreciation of all of us for the fine service given by the gentleman from Maryland in his tenure as president of the association. He has indeed done an outstanding job. He deserves and has the appreciation of all of us. [Applause.]

Jim Quigley, we welcome you and will welcome you in July to the august position now held by the gentleman from Maryland, and we promise you our undying support throughout your tenure. We are sure it will be successful.

Now, before terminating these proceedings, I do want to suggest again that if any of you did not hear your names called, you check with the clerk to make sure that your presence is recorded so that the world will know that you attended these proceedings. I want to personally wish you all good luck, and, of course, we will be seeing a lot of each other for the next several days, and I will welcome that.

On behalf of the Speaker, the Chair announces that the House will convene at 12:15, and, without objection, these proceedings will be terminated and the meeting of the U.S. Association of Former Members in the House Chamber will be adjourned.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House continued in

recess until 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

□ 1210

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the recess have the privilege of revising their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EQUAL TREATMENT FOR VETERANS' COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, veterans' compensation and veterans' pensions must receive the same treatment in the fiscal year 1986 budget as those receiving Social Security benefits.

You can't grant a Social Security cost-of-living increase and then deny that same COLA to the veteran who is paralyzed from the neck down from a wound received in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, most veterans' organizations will support whatever Congress does on COLA's, as long as the veterans are treated the same as Social Security recipients and other Government pensioners.

CENTRAL AMERICA: A DOSE OF REALITY

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, after our recent vote against sending aid to the Nicaraguan Contras, Nicaragua's President Daniel Ortega flew to Russia to request economic aid for his ailing country. Some people were surprised by this move by President Ortega, and they are angered to the point of drafting new legislation to provide so-called humanitarian aid to the forces fighting Mr. Ortega's government. But that aid to the Contras was wrong in the past, and it is wrong now.

The Rio Treaty prohibits the use of aggression by one signatory country against another signatory country.

The United States has signed the Rio Treaty, and so has Nicaragua, yet we have used aggressive force against Nicaragua in violation of the Rio Treaty, a government which President Reagan recognizes and with which he maintains diplomatic relations. The Nicaraguan Contras are fighting against this elected government of their country, and our administration and others in Congress continue to fight for aid to help these Contra forces overthrow the Nicaraguan Government. It defies logic that the United States would at the same time recognize the very government it seeks to overthrow.

In addition, the war that the Contras are fighting is by guerrilla warfare; in other words, terrorism. This is the same terrorism that our President repeatedly denounces when it is conducted against our country; yet he wants to justify the use of terrorism when it is against Nicaragua. The use of terrorism is not detached and clean and technical; it is dirty and gruesome and tragic. Terrorism is kidnapping, it is rape, and it is dismemberment; it is murder, plain and simple, and I for one do not want our country to be a party to illegal terrorism against a government recognized by our own government as the head of Nicaragua. It is wrong to aid the Contras in this illegal terroristic endeavor.

But I hear my colleagues coming forward now to support so-called humanitarian aid to the Contras—as if this would not promote terrorism and somehow transcends the illegality and immorality of the war against Nicaragua. If we help the Contras in any way, we ourselves are committing rape and dismemberment and murder. The blood they draw is on our hands.

There are peaceful means of settling the unrest in Central America, and the United States has pledged to other countries in the United Nations and the Organization of American States to pursue these peaceful means. But so far, the United States has reneged on its promises, and we must be held accountable. The American people will hold the President accountable when the atrocities we have committed in Central America and, I fear, will commit in Central America, come to light.

□ 1220

LET US TAKE THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND OUT OF THE BUDGET

(Ms. OAKAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that President Reagan broke his promise to the elderly. He promised during the campaign not to

touch Social Security and not to touch their cost-of-living adjustment. Now we understand that he has agreed with the Senate to freeze the cost-of-living adjustment.

What is ironic is that the Social Security trust fund has a surplus; it is flourishing. So the deficit is not caused by the older Americans. The Social Security trust fund should never be part of the budget; it never was until 1969.

Let us take the trust fund out of the budget the way it was when President Roosevelt signed it into law in 1936.

Mr. Speaker, I also oppose freezing the cost-of-living adjustment for Federal employees and military retirees. Let us stop this assault on our older Americans. It is hard enough for them to live on the means that they have. They are not responsible for the Reagan deficit.

IS THERE WISDOM IN FINANCING HIT SQUADS IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday an article in the Washington Post revealed that President Reagan approved a CIA covert operation that directed the CIA to train and support counterterrorist units for first-strike attacks against suspected terrorists in the Middle East. Later, one of these units made up of foreign proxies, without CIA authorization, detonated a car bomb and killed more than 80 persons.

Today, I am introducing a House resolution with my colleague, Representative DON EDWARDS, that requires the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency to provide the House with information relating to the training and support of these covert terrorist units, so that we can determine its legality.

Essentially we are funding terrorist activities in the Middle East.

In an area as volatile as the Middle East, we don't need to set loose foreign proxies to participate in ill-conceived operations.

While we have this resolution to question the legality of these terrorist units, we don't need a resolution to question President Reagan's wisdom in setting them up.

Where is the wisdom in financing hit squads in the Middle East, which is already a hair trigger? Do we think that this would help the view of Americans that led to the bombing of our barracks in Beirut? Is this a wise use of our tax dollars?

I don't think so, Mr. President.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM M. O'BRIEN

(Mr. O'BRIEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday night, a fire, suspected to have been arson-instigated, caused the death of William M. O'Brien and his beautiful wife, Mary Jane, in their home in Grosse Pointe, MI. Mrs. O'Brien I knew only slightly; Bill I have known since kindergarten. What provokes me into making this statement is the remarkable nature of the fellow, an example of what we would like to be: a superior student in all schools, he served in the counterintelligence of the FBI, he starred in basketball at Loyola University, and became a nationally recognized figure in industrial relations first with Ford and later with Chrysler.

It is not so significant that Bill was respected by his corporate peers; what matters is what the Nation's leading labor leaders thought of him. Douglas Fraser said it best in his terse summary: "Impeccable integrity separates Bill from so many other corporate negotiators."

Mr. Speaker, in medieval times, specialties were ignored and demeaned. What was revered and respected was the complete man or woman, a person who excelled in everything he or she attempted.

Bill O'Brien is today's version of that kind of man. He excelled in everything he tried and he made it look easy. He will be conspicuous by his absence in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of a poem—Bill's passing recalls to me an unpublished poem of Noel Coward written shortly before his death:

When I have fears as Keats had fears
Of the moment I'll cease to be
I comfort myself with vanished years
Remembered laughter, remembered tears
The peace of a tranquil sea.
And I think of my friends who are dead and gone
How happy they are, I cannot yet know
But happy am I who loved them so.

KOREAN WAR MEMORIAL ACT

(Mr. FLORIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the great commemorations marking the end of World War II and the huge ticker tape parade held in New York City last week honoring the Vietnam war veterans, I would like to take a moment to reflect upon the lot of the Korean war veteran.

The Korean war veteran is sometimes referred to as the "forgotten veteran." For him there was no warm welcome home—not even a belated one as we are now finally according the

Vietnam veteran. For the Korean war veteran and for the 54,000 American service men and women killed in that tragic war, there was nothing. And there is still nothing to this day.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 2205, the Korean War Memorial Act, which would for the very first time call upon the Federal Government to officially recognize the exploits and sacrifices made by our people in that war. The bill calls upon the Government to erect a memorial on Government-owned land here in the District of Columbia. The memorial would remind all of us of the horrible sacrifice which freedom sometimes demands of a brave people.

Chairman SONNY MONTGOMERY of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, ranking minority member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, have joined with me as original cosponsors of this bill. Already some 25 of my colleagues have become cosponsors. It is an idea which is long overdue and I urge that all of my colleagues examine the facts of this issue and join with us to ensure that these "forgotten veterans" are remembered by those for whom they fought and died.

Thank you.

THERE THE PRESIDENT GOES AGAIN, RENEGING ON HIS SOCIAL SECURITY PROMISES

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Senate took action on the budget. I greet this action with mixed feelings and concern. First of all, I am impressed that they finally came to reconcile the fact that we cannot continue a recordbreaking, budget-busting, military buildup. Second, however, and most importantly, I am very concerned about the loss and denial of cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's].

The record indicates that such a loss of COLA would mean that an additional 300,000 to 400,000 senior citizens would fall below the poverty line. I am very concerned about the President's position and attitude. He is retreating from his campaign promises not to reduce Social Security benefits generally and not to deny the COLA for Social Security specifically.

Mr. Speaker, at every turn when the question has come up for support of Social Security during the last 4 years, the President has answered by reneging on his initial support and commitment during the Presidential political campaigns in 1980 and 1984.

It has taken 4 years for the President to come around to make the promise and the commitments again

not to cut Social Security. Now, less than 4 months after the election, President Reagan is leading the charge against Social Security and in favor of eliminating the Social Security COLA's for 1986.

Mr. Speaker, I object and I might say, Mr. President, there you go again. There you go again, Mr. President, renege on your political commitments to older Americans who depend on Social Security. This proposal to cut Social Security cost-of-living adjustments is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and many in this Congress, the people's House of Representatives will strongly fight the President's efforts to take away older Americans hard-earned Social Security pensions benefits.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROBINSON). Pursuant to the provisions of clauses 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Tuesday, May 14, 1985.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH BENEFITS PLANS

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 873) to permit employee organizations, which are not eligible to participate in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program solely because of the requirement that applications for approval be filed before January 1, 1980, to apply for approval to offer a health benefits plan, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 873

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY FOR ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION PLANS.

(a) DEFINITION OF AN EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION.—Section 8901(8) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(8) 'employee organization' means—

"(A) an association or other organization of employees which is national in scope, or in which membership is open to all employees of a Government agency who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under this chapter and which, after December 31, 1978, and before January 1, 1980, applied to the Office for approval of a plan provided under section 8903(3) of this title; and

"(B) an association or other organization which is national in scope, in which membership is open only to employees, annuitants, or former spouses, or any combination thereof, and which, during the 90-day period beginning on the date of enactment of section 8903a of this title, applied to the

Office for approval of a plan provided under such section;"

(b) AUTHORITY FOR ADDITIONAL PLANS.—

(1) Title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 8903 the following:

"§ 8903a. Additional health benefits plans

"(a) In addition to any plan under section 8903 of this title, the Office of Personnel Management may contract for or approve one or more health benefits plans under this section.

"(b) A plan under this section may not be contracted for or approved unless it—

"(1) is sponsored or underwritten, and administered, in whole or substantial part, by an employee organization described in section 8901(8)(B) of this title;

"(2) offers benefits of the types named by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 8904 of this title or both;

"(3) provides for benefits only by paying for, or providing reimbursement for, the cost of such benefits (as provided for under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 8903 of this title) or a combination thereof; and

"(4) is available only to individuals who, at the time of enrollment, are full members of the organization and to members of their families.

"(c) A contract for a plan approved under this section shall require the carrier—

"(1) to enter into an agreement approved by the Office with an underwriting subcontractor licensed to issue group health insurance in all the States and the District of Columbia; or

"(2) to demonstrate ability to meet reasonable minimum financial standards prescribed by the Office.

"(d) For the purpose of this section, an individual shall be considered a full member of an organization if such individual is eligible to exercise all rights and privileges incident to full membership in such organization (determined without regard to the right to hold elected office)."

(2) The analysis for chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 8903 the following:

"8903a. Additional health benefits plans."

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Sections 8902(a), 8902(e), 8902(i), 8905(a), 8905(c)(1), 8905(f), 8908(b), and 8913(b) of title 5, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "8903 of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "8903 or 8903a of this title".

(b) Section 8903(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "employee organizations," and inserting in lieu thereof "employee organizations described in section 8901(8)(A) of this title".

(c) Section 8905(f) of title 5, United States Code, is further amended by striking out "plan described by that section" and inserting in lieu thereof "such plan".

(d) Section 8907(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "section 8903" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 8903 and 8903a".

(e) Section 8909(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in inserting "or 8903a" before "of this title"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "If the successor organization is an organization described in section 8901(8)(B) of this title, any employee, annuitant, or former spouse so transferred may not remain enrolled in the plan after the end of the contract term in which the merger

occurs unless that individual is a full member of such organization (as determined under section 8903a(d) of this title)."

(f) Section 8909(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "or 8903a" before "of this title".

(g) Section 1840(d)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "or 8903a" after "8903".

SEC. 3. INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR RESTORED DISABILITY ANNUITANTS.

(a) HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) Section 8908 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) A disability annuitant whose disability annuity under section 8337 of this title was terminated and is later restored under the second or third sentence of subsection (e) of such section may, under regulations prescribed by the Office, enroll in a health benefits plan described by section 8903 or 8903a of this title if such annuitant was covered by any such plan immediately before such annuity was terminated."

(2)(A) The section heading for section 8908 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 8908. Coverage of restored employees and survivor or disability annuitants."

(B) The analysis for chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item relating to section 8908 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"8908. Coverage of restored employees and survivor or disability annuitants."

(b) LIFE INSURANCE.—Section 8706 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(g) If the insurance of a former employee receiving a disability annuity under section 8337 of this title stops because of the termination of such annuity, and such annuity is thereafter restored under the second or third sentence of subsection (e) of such section, such former employee may, under regulations prescribed by the Office, elect to resume the insurance coverage which was so stopped."

(c) APPLICABILITY; NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT; CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to any individual whose disability annuity is or was restored under section 8337(e) of title 5, United States Code, after December 31, 1983.

(2)(A) The Office of Personnel Management shall notify each individual under subparagraph (B) of any rights which such individual may have under section 8706(g) or section 8908(c) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this section, including any procedures or deadlines which may apply with respect to the exercise of those rights.

(B) Notification under this paragraph shall be provided to any individual who, as of the 90th day after the date of enactment of this Act, is receiving a disability annuity which was restored to such individual under section 8337(e) of title 5, United States Code, after December 31, 1983.

(3)(A) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize—

(i) coverage under chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, in the case of any individual who makes an election under section 8706(g) of such title (as amended by this Act), for any period before the date of such election; or

(ii) coverage under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, in the case of any individual who becomes enrolled in a health benefits plan under section 8908(c) of such title (as amended by this Act), for any period before the date as of which such individual becomes so enrolled.

(B) This paragraph applies with respect to any individual receiving a disability annuity which is or was restored under section 8337(e) of title 5, United States Code, after December 31, 1983, and before the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House is considering H.R. 873, a bill to allow additional employee organizations to participate in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program [FEHBP] and to restore Federal health and life insurance benefits to certain disabled annuitants.

H.R. 873 was introduced by Congressman NORMAN DICKS of Washington, along with Congressmen VIC FAZIO of California, SAM STRATTON of New York, and FRANK WOLF of Virginia. The bill was ordered reported by a voice vote of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on Wednesday, May 8, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The basic purpose of this legislation is to permit the creation of new plans that can be tailored to fit the needs and resources of certain groups of FEHBP participants. In so doing, the bill will enable some participants to select health coverage that might not be offered presently by existing plans.

As chair of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee benefits, I conducted hearings last year on identical legislation, then H.R. 1517. At that hearing, witnesses testified that bringing new plans into the Federal Health Insurance Program, if done properly, could enhance the choices available to program participants without additional cost to the Government.

On May 7, the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee benefits considered and approved an amendment which I introduced in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 873. My amendment responded to the concerns raised at the hearings and set forth an order-

ly process for enabling additional employee organization plans to be offered in the FEHBP. The revised H.R. 873 establishes a 90-day period, beginning on the date of enactment of the legislation, during which new employee organization plans may be submitted for approval to the OPM for inclusion in the FEHBP. In order to be eligible for approval, these new plans must meet all the requirements of existing law, and the following requirements as well.

The plans must provide health benefits to enrollees either on a fee-for-service or an indemnity basis;

The plans must be open only to bona fide members of the sponsoring employee organization and their families, including former spouses;

The plans must be open to retired members, as well as to actively employed members of the sponsoring organization; and

The plans must satisfy requirements for financial solvency as prescribed by OPM.

Newly accepted plans will be open for enrollment during the following regularly scheduled open season.

These changes to H.R. 873 are important to ensure the orderly inclusion in the FEHBP of additional, qualified employee organization plans, and to allow for an even greater range of choices for participants in this insurance program.

In addition, H.R. 873, as amended, corrects a long-standing inequity with regard to disability annuitants. Under current law, a disability annuitant who participated in the FEHBP and life insurance programs and whose annuity was terminated is not permitted to again participate in the FEHBP or life insurance programs upon restoration of the annuity. H.R. 873 would allow the individual to participate in these programs upon restoration of the annuity by enrolling and paying the annuitant's portion of the subscription cost.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the enactment of this legislation will result in additional Government outlays of less than \$500,000 per year. This legislation is supported by the administration and by the minority members of the committee. At this point, I would like to thank the minority members, Mr. MYERS of Indiana and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, for their cooperation and partnership in passing this legislation. It is certainly a pleasure to work with them.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to thank the employee organizations and other groups who have contributed to the development of this legislation. In addition, I especially would like to thank congressmen NORM DICKS, VIC FAZIO, SAM STRATTON, and FRANK WOLF for their support of this bill. I urge my

colleagues to vote to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 873.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for her very kind remarks.

The minority is pleased to support H.R. 873, as amended, which provides authority to add employee organization health plans to the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

Under existing law, employee organizations cannot sponsor new plans in the FEHB. This bill establishes a 90-day period during which employee organizations may apply to the Office of Personnel Management to sponsor FEHB plans. It also contains safeguards to ensure new plans are financially sound.

H.R. 873 was reported favorably by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee with broad bipartisan support. The bill also is supported by the administration, and, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the addition of a small number of health insurance plans to the large number already available is not expected to significantly alter Federal costs.

This legislation also corrects an oversight with respect to disability annuities. Under current law, if the outside earnings of a disabled annuitant rises above a certain amount, the annuity is terminated and Federal health and life insurance benefits are terminated. The problem is that if the individual's outside earnings fall below a certain threshold in the next year, he or she cannot recapture Federal or life insurance benefits. Only the disability annuity is restored. This legislation will correct that oversight. I urge a favorable vote on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 2 minutes.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to one of the major sponsors of the bill, Mr. FAZIO.

I want to say at this juncture that I certainly appreciated the cooperation of this distinguished Member and chairman of one of the important subcommittees for allowing the committee, the Post Office Committee, to work its will and produce a piece of legislation that could be done without any loopholes in it; and I know it took a little time to do that, and I appreciate the patience of my friend from California, and I am sure his Federal managers, along with other groups, are deeply grateful for the work he has done on this issue.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding to me, and I sincerely appreciate the responsible approach that the gentlewoman has taken to the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, bringing it to the floor today is the culmination of a great deal of effort on behalf of many members of the Federal Managers Association, which is well-represented in my district.

I would like to pay particular tribute to Ms. OAKAR for the approach she took, which was to slow down the hell-bent-for-leather approach to enactment of this bill in order to consider it in the context of all other Federal health benefit programs.

I think the more deliberate approach, using the authorizing committee has certainly borne fruit in bringing to the floor a very thoroughly researched and well-documented piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to express my personal appreciation to her and to lend my strongest possible support to the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my personal appreciation to Congresswoman OAKAR for her cooperation in moving forward on providing an opportunity for Federal employee organizations who are not now eligible to participate in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program [FEHBP] to do so.

As one of the original cosponsors of H.R. 873 which was introduced by my good friend and colleague Congressman NORM DICKS, I have been particularly supportive of this effort. This past fall, in hearings held by Ms. OAKAR, chair of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I testified on behalf of this legislation.

The Federal Managers Association is one of the organizations that is particularly interested in this legislation. As a Member who has two major FMA chapters in my congressional district, chapter 77 at McClellan AFB and chapter 167 at Travis AFB, I have heard from my constituents about the benefits of having a health plan particularly suited to their needs.

I believe that what Ms. OAKAR has accomplished with this bill is not only providing an opportunity for organizations like FMA, but by incorporating her substitute, she has improved the original legislation.

There will be a 90-day period, beginning the day of enactment during which organizations can submit a plan to OPM for inclusion in FEHBP. Such plans must meet all requirements of existing law as well as:

The plan must provide health benefits on a fee-for-service basis, an in-

demnity basis, or some combination of the two;

The plan must meet financial solvency standards as prescribed by OPM;

The plan must be open only to bona fide members of the sponsoring employee organization and their families; and

The plan must be open only to both actively employed and retired members of the sponsoring organization.

Under existing law the annuity of a disabled employee is terminated if the individual is determined to be restored to earning capacity. Upon termination of the annuity, health and life insurance benefits are terminated. An individual whose disability resumes is entitled to have the annuity restored but may not resume participation in the Government health and life insurance programs. The substitute would permit such an individual to resume health and life insurance participation.

There are still many problems with the Federal employee health plans that need to be addressed. This legislation is not part of that overall effort. That will be done in the context of a larger piece of legislation which Ms. OAKAR's subcommittee has under consideration now. I very much support her efforts in this regard and will be working with her on that legislation.

For now, however, I commend her for moving H.R. 873, and I urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass this bill.

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the distinguished gentleman, another fine, major sponsor of the legislation, Congressman STRATTON who, along with other Members that I have mentioned, did some very fine work on this legislation.

I yield to the gentleman from New York as much time as he may consume.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise today in support of the bill H.R. 873, which will allow additional Federal employee organizations to participate in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. I want especially to thank my good friend, the chairlady of the subcommittee, MARY ROSE OAKAR, for her support and attention to this matter. It has been a pleasure to work with her as this legislation has moved through the legislative process.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 873, and supporter of this legislation in previous years, I am glad to see it come to the floor of the House today. I am also in total agreement with the changes made by the subcommittee with respect to the time limit for application to OPM for new health benefits plans, and with regard to the requirements that organizations must meet to apply for a new plan.

This issue of special interest to me because the president of the Federal

Managers' Association, Mr. Michael Minahan, of Troy, NY, is one of my constituents. The unique feature of this bill is that it will allow groups of employees to create new plans in the FEHBP that can be tailored to the special needs and resources of those groups of participants, thus saving money for the Federal Government as well as the employees.

I therefore urge my colleagues to support this bill, and thank again the chairlady and members of the subcommittee for their support in this matter.

□ 1240

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, with permission of my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] to proceed out of order.

CIA ACTION IS POSSIBLE VIOLATION OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of concern that we read about not only the CIA hiring mercenaries to wage battle in Nicaragua, but also apparently to train a group of antiterrorists in Lebanon, and one of the groups, apparently on its own, went out and bombed with a car bomb residences in Beirut and killed 80 people and injured 200 more.

The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] and I have put into the hopper a resolution of inquiry. Certainly the House of Representatives is entitled to know all of the facts about this very, very serious possible violation of several Executive orders and indeed perhaps a violation of law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield to me an additional minute?

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, we are on the health bill, but I will yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

A TRAGIC SIMPLIFICATION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] it was some time ago when we had our Marines very heavily engaged in Lebanon that many Members of this body and many members of the general public as well said, "Why don't we retaliate for the attacks that were made against us? Why don't we retaliate for what happened to the Marine Corps barracks and for these other attacks on our installations and embassy?"

I am not privileged to be a member of the Committee on Intelligence so I don't know the inside facts. But I think, clearly, from what has come out in the press, what we were doing in the instance the gentleman refers to was to provide just such a form of retaliation. I feel sure most of the citizens of the United States feel that we should have retaliated. To suggest

that this is somehow OK for the Moslems to blow up our Marines, but is immoral for us to retaliate seems to me to be a tragic simplification. Obviously if this is what happened, no Government official will advertise it in advance.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 873 of which I am an original cosponsor. This legislation enjoys bipartisan support and fills a need for an important group of Federal employees; namely, our managers. I would like to commend my colleague from Washington, Mr. Dicks, for introducing this bill and would also like to commend Mr. STRATTON and Mr. FAZIO who joined me in cosponsoring this measure. H.R. 873 will permit Federal employee organizations not currently eligible, to participate in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

Since January 1, 1980, the FEHBP has restricted entry to health maintenance organizations, and new employee organizations were barred. Passage of this important and noncontroversial measure, which is the culmination of several years of effort by one of the most highly regarded and responsible employee organizations, the Federal Managers Association, will allow new employee organizations to participate in the FEHBP. I believe it is important that we open the FEHBP to organizations, such as the Federal Managers Association, which have grown and now wish to participate.

H.R. 873 provides a 90-day window to allow Federal employee organizations, not now providing health insurance under FEHBP, to do so for their members and retired members only and will therefore have little impact on current health plans.

During the 90-day period, employee organizations may apply to the Office of Personnel Management [OPM] to sponsor a FEHBP plan. Employee organizations or associations which apply during this period must be national in scope and open only to employees, annuitants, and former spouses.

Under the provisions of H.R. 873, OPM may not approve or contract for a health benefit during this 90-day period unless the plan meets all of the requirements for existing employees organization plans under the FEHBP and the following additional requirements:

The plan must provide health benefits on a fee-for-service basis, an indemnity basis, or some combination of the two.

The plan must meet the financial solvency standard prescribed by OPM.

The plan must be open only to bona fide members of the sponsoring employee organization and their families; and

The plan must be open both to actively employed and retired members of the sponsoring organization.

Mr. Speaker, in a time when the pay and benefits of Federal employees are being challenged, I think it is important to improve the morale of Federal workers. Here is an opportunity for us to provide a benefit, that is not an added expense, for our Federal managers. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to be able to yield to my two colleagues to engage in a discussion of other business. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California, as long as I was able to yield him some time.

I would also like to say, getting back to the health bill that we are trying to get passed here, H.R. 873, that I do not believe this is the last that we are going to do in terms of health reform for our very fine outstanding Government employees. I personally feel that we do not offer the kinds of comprehensive coverage that we ought to. I think that they have to pay too much, 40 percent or more, of their own health benefit, which in the last few years they have gotten about 50 percent, they have paid more than 50 percent and have gotten 12 percent less benefits. This is not the last of health bills that hopefully our committee will pass. We are trying to have some hearings right now on another bill I have introduced, H.R. 156, and I am hoping that in the near future we can bring that bill to the floor which will cover some of the gaps which are not covered now.

But I would like to thank my colleagues for their support of this bill.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the minority certainly agrees with the majority on this bill, but just so that there will not be any misunderstanding, this Member does not agree with what the gentleman from California had to say. So I do want it to be implied, since we did not respond, that we agree with his comments.

Ms. OAKAR. We did yield to him, and I think it is important to state our opinion about what he said. I happen to agree with him, and the gentleman from Indiana does not, and I have the greatest respect for my colleague from Indiana.

● Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, as the original sponsor of H.R. 873, I want to thank Chairwoman OAKAR for her work on this legislation. I think the

amendments added by the subcommittee strengthen the legislation. They ensure that it meets its stated purpose, and were developed in light of issues raised in hearings on this legislation last year.

This bill would provide a limited 90-day period in which employee organizations could apply to the Office of Personnel Management to sponsor a health care insurance plan under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. It would be the first such opportunity in 6 years. It would provide an opportunity for employee organizations to provide coverage that is tailored to the needs of their membership, could encourage cost savings, and promote competition.

The bill before the House provides protections to ensure that health care plans submitted to OPM will be serious proposals with the necessary financial backing. Specifically the bill requires that such plans meet all the requirements for existing employee organization plans and also:

Provide health benefits on a fee-for-service basis, an indemnity basis, or some combination of the two;

Meet financial solvency standards as prescribed by OPM;

Be open only to bona fide members of the sponsoring employee organization and their families; and

Be open to employees, annuitants, and former spouses.

The reason that I sponsored this legislation along with 19 of my colleagues was because I believe that one of the strengths of the FEHB Program is the competition it allows among health care plans and the ability it provides to tailor coverage to individual needs. This limited 90-day period will allow organizations who have given this question careful consideration over the last 6 years an opportunity to offer such tailored coverage. The short time period and the criteria developed by the committee will guard against frivolous efforts.

This legislation was initiated primarily to provide an opportunity for the Federal Manager's Association to offer a health care plan tailored to its particular needs and requirements. FMA was founded in 1913, and now has 17,000 members in 175 chapters representing most of the agencies and departments of the Federal Government. It is clearly an accepted advocacy group for the views and concerns of management personnel. The organization is growing at a healthy rate of 1,500 members a year. FMA has worked on the development of a health care plan for their members over the last 6 years. They plan to contract with a reputable private firm with a strong record of providing health care coverage if given the opportunity by this legislation. They have indicated to me their desire to in-

clude strong cost control mechanisms in their plan.

The desire of FMA to tailor their own plan stems from the unique demographic makeup of their organization, somewhat older and in a higher income bracket than other organizations presently offering plans. It also reflects the differing aspects of managerial work, with a proportionately higher emphasis on stress and mental health coverage. These areas can serve to prevent higher costs later.

While I have not been contacted and the hearings have not revealed any other organization which plans to take advantage of this opportunity, no one is precluded from seeking OPM approval assuming the criteria laid out in this bill can be met.

Because this is a modest window and because of the strict conditions included in the bill, no major influx of applications is expected.

As with all legislation, there are concerns about cost. I would note that the Congressional Budget Office expects no significant additional cost to the Government from this legislation. My own expectation is that we will ultimately save money as a result of cost control mechanisms and emphasis on preventative care.●

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 873, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that employee organizations which are not eligible to participate in the Federal employee health benefits program solely because of the requirement that applications for approval be filed before January 1, 1980, may apply to become eligible, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill, H.R. 873.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON SQUARE AT INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK IN PHILADELPHIA

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 105) to provide for the inclusion of the Washington Square area within Independence National Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 105

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061; 16 U.S.C. 407m et seq.), is amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"Sec. 8. (a) The area known as Washington Square (bounded generally by Walnut Street on the north, Sixth Street on the east, and the intersecting streets named 'Washington Square' on the west and south) is hereby included within the Independence National Historical Park.

"(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into a cooperative agreement with the city of Philadelphia (acting through its designated agency, the Fairmount Park Commission) to provide technical assistance in the preservation and interpretation of the property known as Washington Square. Such agreement shall contain, but shall not be limited to, provisions that the Secretary, through the National Park Service, shall have right of access at all reasonable times to all public portions of the property for the purpose of conducting visitors through the grounds and interpreting them to the public, and that no major changes or alterations shall be made in the property, including its buildings and grounds, except by mutual agreement between the Secretary and the city."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. McCAIN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the pending measure, H.R. 105.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us, H.R. 105, was introduced by our colleague TOM FOGLIETTA, on January 3, 1985. The purpose of the bill is to provide for the inclusion of Washington Square within the boundaries of Independence National Historical Park and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement with the city of Philadelphia to provide technical assistance in the management of the square.

Washington Square, which lies adjacent to Independence Hall, has a long and distinguished history that primarily centers on the American Revolution. Originally established as South-east Square in 1683, the park in 1706 was designated as a "public burying ground." During the Revolutionary War, Washington Square served as a burial place for more than 2,000 unknown Revolutionary War dead. Some of those buried in Washington Square died from wounds or disease in Independence Hall itself, which had been turned into a prison during the British occupation of Philadelphia. The square, which is presently listed on the National Register of Historic Places, is the site of a memorial to the Unknown Soldiers of the American Revolution constructed in the mid-1950's.

While H.R. 105 would include Washington Square within the boundary of the Independence Hall National Historical Park, the square itself would remain under the ownership and management of the city of Philadelphia. The legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement with the city limited to providing technical assistance in the preservation and interpretation of the Square. This language will thus grant the national recognition that Washington Square deserves without incurring direct Federal expenditure.

During the 98th Congress, the House passed legislation identical to H.R. 105 on September 24, 1984. However, the legislation was not considered by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA] for his leadership on this matter and I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, Washington Square in the city of Philadelphia is deserving of national recognition and I rise in support of H.R. 105 which promotes recognition of this historic landmark.

H.R. 105 includes Washington Square within the boundary of Independence National Historical Park and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement with the city of Philadelphia to provide technical assistance to the city to aid in the preservation and interpretation of Washington Square.

Washington Square is one of five public squares in the city of Philadelphia laid out by William Penn's chief surveyor, Capt. Thomas Holmes. The city designated Washington Square as a common and public burying ground

and more than 2,000 unknown Revolutionary War dead are buried there.

The city went to great lengths to refurbish this square for the dedication to these unknown soldiers and Washington Square is now listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

H.R. 105 will further the city of Philadelphia's efforts to illuminate the history of Washington Square without increasing Federal expenditures. We approved similar legislation last year and I hope swift House adoption of H.R. 105 this year will help ensure its enactment into law in the 99th Congress.

□ 1250

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his support, and include him in terms of my remarks commending him for his work on this bill. It is an important addition to the park.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, I rise in support of H.R. 105. This bill would incorporate the Washington Square area into the boundaries of the Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia. Washington Square, an approximate one block area adjacent to the Independence Hall site of the park, is historically known as the burial grounds for over 2,000 unknown Revolutionary War dead. A memorial was erected on the site in 1957 to honor the unknown soldiers who fought in the war.

Mr. Speaker, identical legislation to H.R. 105 was approved by the House last Congress. Once again, this legislation authorizes the National Park Service to provide technical assistance to the city of Philadelphia through a cooperative agreement for the purposes of preserving and interpreting Washington Square for park visitors. Although the Congressional Budget Office has determined that enactment of H.R. 105 would not result in any significant costs to the Federal Government, I do have some concerns that the addition of Washington Square may result in future Federal expenditures. According to the National Park Service (NPS), it would cost over \$2 million to bring this area up to NPS standards, as well as approximately \$160,000 per year to maintain the area. While such work is not required under this bill, there may indeed come a time when the city of Philadelphia requests Federal funds in the future to assist with the upkeep of the Washington Square area. I believe that during these difficult financial times, we must

exercise fiscal responsibility with regard to the future as well.

In spite of this concern, I believe the purpose of the legislation is well-founded. It is my opinion that Washington Square would serve as a significant addition to Independence National Park, which commemorates the birth and struggle of the independence movement of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting and, indeed, an obligation to honor those brave young men who struggled and sacrificed in order that 13 tiny colonies might achieve independence and freedom. We should never forget their sacrifice, and the vital ingredient, of which they were, to securing our Nation's freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING].

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Minnesota for his initiative in moving this legislation again. A similar bill passed the last Congress, after the Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks had field hearings in Philadelphia as well as hearings in Washington.

Not only did many people interested in American history testify in support of this bill, but many veterans' organizations, as one might expect, because of the fact that 2,000 dead of the Revolutionary War are buried there. Dead American soldiers. There is a small memorial there, but otherwise, there is no particular recognition, and it is right catty-cornered across the street from Independence Hall. It does seem like an oversight that it was not included within the boundaries of the National Historic Park.

No one can go to the National Historic Park in Philadelphia without being inspired. Not only by the historic events that have taken place there, but by the tremendous job that the National Park Service has done in reconditioning many of the buildings and providing excellent interpretation.

It does seem to me that even though some of the historians of the Park Service did not feel that it qualified to be on the National Register of Historic Sites, because there was no battle there, merely 2,000 Revolutionary War heroes buried there in what was a potter's field.

That "merely" is a pretty big thing in my book. I think Tom FOGLIETTA, who was the author of this bill, and Congressman KOSTMAYER, Congressman COUGHLIN, and others from the Philadelphia area who supported it, should be commended for doing so. This bill will cost the Federal Government virtually nothing. It will merely give recognition to a sacred site that

ought to be part of the National Historic Park.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Public Lands and National Park Subcommittee for his leadership and his work in the last Congress. It has made our job considerably less duty this year on account of that.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 105.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EROSION CONTROL AT CUYA-HOGA VALLEY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 934) to provide certain authority to reduce erosion within the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 934

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 4(c) of the Act of December 27, 1974 (88 Stat. 1784; 16 U.S.C. 460ff-3(c)) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(c)" and by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(2) The Secretary is authorized and directed, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, the State of Ohio, and affected local governments, to undertake a program of land treatment for the purpose of restoring suitable vegetative cover to substantially eliminate erosion from all lands, public and private, within the authorized boundaries of the recreation area. In the case of any private lands, within such authorized boundaries such treatment may be undertaken only with the consent of the owner thereof and shall be contingent upon assurances that such land treatment will be maintained by the owner for a period of not less than ten years. The Secretary shall, in conjunction with such program, take such actions as may be required to correct areas of ecological degradation which create hazards to health and safety."

(b) Section 6 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 460ff-5) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than \$500,000 for fiscal year 1986, \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1987, \$1,500,000 for fiscal year 1988, and \$1,750,000 for fiscal year 1989, to carry out the provisions of section 4(c)(2) of this Act. Any amounts authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year under this subsection which are not appropriated for that fiscal year shall remain available for appropriation in succeeding fiscal years."

SEC. 2. No authority under this Act to enter into contracts or to make payments

shall be effective except to the extent and in such amounts as provided in advance in appropriations Act. Any provision of this Act which authorizes the enactment of new budget authority shall be effective only for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. McCAIN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this pending measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 934 was introduced by our colleague, JOHN SEIBERLING. The purpose of the legislation is to provide authority to the National Park Service to take needed actions to reduce erosion on all lands within the boundary of the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area.

The problem of erosion from lands within the Cuyahoga River drainage basin and the resultant sediment that is deposited in Cleveland Harbor has been the focus of ongoing study. With the U.S. Corps of Engineers spending about \$4 million per year to dredge the sediment that collects in the harbor, considerable effort has been expended to pinpoint sources of erosion. Studies have focused on the erosion of lands within the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area as a major source of the Cuyahoga River sedimentation problem.

Less than half of the 32,460 acres of land within the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area is presently owned by the Federal Government. As such, the ability of the National Park Service to deal with erosion problems on much of the land within the park's boundary is extremely limited. The National Park Service has already identified 34 sites encompassing 625 acres of land, both publicly and privately owned, that need extensive reclamation work. Last month, I visited the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area and saw the erosion problem firsthand. The legislation before us today is a viable and necessary tool in stemming the active and accelerated erosion that is occurring on park property.

I would also like to point out that this legislation can be a money saver. The Corps of Engineers estimates that

with an active and ongoing erosion control program in place, they could cut Cleveland Harbor dredging by 30 percent at a savings of over \$1 million per year in Federal dollars.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is necessary. The geology of the area while interesting also is a problem. Over the length of the Cuyahoga Recreation Area, the water drops over 800 feet to Lake Erie. It is important that the National Government meet the problem in a special manner.

The Park Service is doing their part; they have one of the few soil scientists working in the National Park Service assigned to the Cuyahoga Recreation Area. He is doing a good job, but without adequate resources and without the ability to actually deal with the 8,000 acres of private land, I do not believe that these efforts will be successful.

This legislation and the authority that it grants, and the cooperative agreements that it anticipates from these private landowners, would put in place the ability to deal with the private holdings with some assurance, of success. Private land holders must match the Government improvement with a 10-year commitment to keep up the anti-erosion work that is actually accomplished by virtue of the agreements and by virtue of the Federal dollars that would be spent under this legislative authorization.

□ 1300

I would strongly urge my colleagues to support this as a bill that will save money, that will reduce the dredging cost and will, of course, preserve the Cuyahoga Recreation Area characteristics which are so valuable in this urban setting and responsible for its initial designation as a part of our National Park System.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to briefly comment on H.R. 934. This legislation would authorize the National Park Service [NPS] to enter into a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the State of Ohio and the affected local governments to initiate a land treatment program to reduce erosion in the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area [NRA].

Since the establishment of the Cuyahoga Valley NRA, soil erosion within its boundaries has been a major problem. Every year, large amounts of soil from former farmland is washed into the Cuyahoga River and carried downstream to Cleveland Harbor, clogging federally maintained ship channels. The erosion problem requires annual dredging by the Corps of Engineers at a cost of \$4 million per year. Although the amount of the sediment attributable to the NRA is disputed, it is clear

that an erosion problem does exist and should be addressed.

H.R. 934 would authorize Federal appropriations of \$4.75 million through fiscal year 1989 for erosion control programs. Although I am concerned about the expenditure of new Federal funds in view of the Federal budget deficits our Nation is facing, H.R. 934 may be the best solution to the problem.

However, I would urge that all of the possible alternative solutions to the Cuyahoga erosion problem be thoroughly examined and considered, including the administration's proposal to enter into an interagency agreement with the Department of Agriculture to work with the private landowners to reclaim the eroding sites.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING] who has literally devoted years of dedicated efforts on behalf of the people of the Cuyahoga Valley in order to solve this terrible erosion problem that has been plaguing them for many, many years.

In any event, I hope the Cuyahoga Valley erosion problem is addressed as soon as possible.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to recognize the work of my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING] on the Cuyahoga Recreation Area establishment, and, of course, the work that he has done in terms of bringing and working out a measure of good public policy with regards to a resolution of that issue in this measure, H.R. 934. He has done an outstanding job. It is a serious problem.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING].

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I sponsored legislation similar to H.R. 934 in the last Congress. I was grateful for the support it received when it was approved by the House, and for the support given by the Interior Committee. Unfortunately, the Senate was unable to complete work on the legislation before adjournment. Today, the need for action on the erosion problem in the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area and the sedimentation problem in Cleveland Harbor continues. I am especially grateful, today, to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation Mr. VENTO, for the great interest he has taken in the erosion and sedimentation problems. Not only did he hold early hearings on H.R. 934 this year, but he also made a site visit to see firsthand the magnitude of the problems in and along the Cuyahoga River.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that this legislation is needed: Three Federal agencies—the Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the U.S. Forest Service—have studied the sedimentation problem in the Cuyahoga River. They have identified the Cuyahoga River drainage basin between Independence and Old Portage stations—basically the northern and southern limits of the Cuyahoga Valley NRA—as the major source of sediment. Lands within the boundaries of the park are estimated to be generating well over half of the sediment in the area.

Unfortunately, little has been done, beyond initial planning, to deal with this problem. The National Park Service has yet to make the kind of continuing commitment needed to control erosion from those park lands identified as sources of sediment. And, although the Park Service testified that it has plans for financing the control of erosion on privately-held lands lying within the boundaries of the park, no action has been taken to formalize a program for private lands. It appears that if Congress does not act, the Park Service will not be able to do the complete job, for there is no incentive to the owners of private lands to do or finance the work themselves.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation could save an estimated 30 percent of the Corps of Engineers' cost of dredging the Cleveland Harbor each year once erosion controls, such as plantings, take hold. This is a potential annual savings of more than \$1 million, year after year. Clearly, this legislation, after the initial \$4.7 million investment, can save the Government money. And, beyond the monetary benefits accruing to the corps and the improvement we can expect in the scenic quality of the Cuyahoga Valley, the Cuyahoga Valley NRA will be able to address the nagging erosion problems which are threatening other resources within the park. The lands that are being lost cannot be replaced—truly there is no time like the present to begin this important work in the Cuyahoga Valley NRA.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 934.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) commemorating the 20th anniversary of Head Start.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 95

Whereas on May 18, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson announced the establishment of Project Head Start;

Whereas by the end of the summer of 1965, nearly five hundred and sixty thousand low-income preschool children had been enrolled in thirteen thousand and four hundred Head Start centers in two thousand five hundred American communities;

Whereas over the past twenty years the Head Start Program has grown from a six-to eight-week summer demonstration program to a year-round early childhood enrichment program;

Whereas over nine million low-income preschool children have been enrolled in and benefited from the Head Start Program since its inception in 1965;

Whereas the Head Start Program has provided essential health, education, nutritional, and social services to these children and their families and has had a profound impact on the physical, social, and cognitive development of these children;

Whereas the emphasis in the Head Start Program on broad-based participation of the parents of children enrolled in the program has contributed in many important ways to the self-sufficiency, self-esteem, and economic and psychological well-being of the parents as well as their children;

Whereas numerous studies have documented the lifelong beneficial effects of participation of Head Start Programs and the cost-effectiveness of the program; and

Whereas the Head Start Program is one of the most effective programs supported by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That May 18, 1985, is commemorated as the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the Head Start Program and that it is the sense of Congress that the Head Start Program has been a highly cost-effective and successful program and that the commitment of the Congress to the Head Start Program is reaffirmed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 95 commemorates the 20th anniversary of Head Start and reaffirms the Congress' commitment to this exemplary child development program. The resolution was introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. Nearly 100 Members of both sides of the aisle

have cosponsored the bill. This demonstrates once again the bipartisan popularity of this program.

Head Start provides comprehensive community-based services to address the health, nutritional, social, and educational needs of some of the Nation's poorest children and their families. As an example of Head Start's successful service delivery, last year 90 percent of Head Start children received medical screening, and of these, 96 percent got the medical treatment they needed. Similarly, 85 percent of all Head Start children received dental examinations, and of these, 96 percent got dental treatment. These programs coupled with strong early educational programs literally give these children a head start.

Head Start is a tremendous success story. The program has helped to focus the attention of the Nation on the importance of early childhood education and development. Research has proved both the long and short term effectiveness of this quality preschool program.

The program is very cost effective. We really minimize the need to spend dollars later on for remedial educational programs. We found out from experience the children who participate in the Head Start Program are generally promoted grade by grade as time ordinarily would have their promotion take place.

Head Start has provided services to more than 9 million disadvantaged youngsters since 1965. It has proved to be one of the Federal Government's most popular, effective, and enduring programs. The upcoming 20th anniversary is an appropriate occasion for Congress to reaffirm its support, so that Head Start can continue to improve the short- and long-term prospects of needy children of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] for bringing this worthwhile resolution to the floor at this time and for giving me the opportunity to join with him in this effort, and urge the Members of this House to support House Concurrent Resolution 95, which, as we know, commemorates the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Head Start Program.

Mr. Speaker, Head Start is widely recognized as one of the most cost-effective and successful programs ever enacted by Congress. Since it began in 1965 as an 8-week summer preschool program enrolling 561,000 children, Head Start has served more than 9.1 million children and families.

With a fiscal year 1985 budget of \$1.1 billion, Head Start is currently serving 442,100 children in 9,000 centers nationwide.

The program also serves nearly 60,000 children with handicaps. In addition, 23 programs serve children of migrant workers, and 36 parent and child centers focus on families with children under the age of three.

Extensive studies have documented the effectiveness of a preschool program. Head Start children score higher on standardized tests; they perform better in school and are less likely to require special education. Studies show that every \$1 spent on Head Start saves \$2.36 that would otherwise be spent on special education and remedial services.

One of the more unique and most successful aspects of Head Start is its emphasis on parent involvement. The program reinforces parents' commitment to their children's well-being and education. Head Start also enjoys strong community support.

Please join me in commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Head Start Program and reaffirming our support for the program and its goals by supporting House Concurrent Resolution 95.

□ 1310

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. Boggs].

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Conference Resolution 95, commemorating the 20th anniversary of Head Start.

Created on May 18, 1965, by President Lyndon B. Johnson, Head Start was a centerpiece of the war on poverty. But while many other early poverty programs have long since been extinguished, Head Start has not only survived, but has expanded and developed. It has thrived because it is accomplishing what it set out to do.

In the early sixties, research established that children who are mentally malnourished during the first few years of life are seriously disadvantaged. They face great difficulty catching up in the classroom. Most never do and face repeated failure in school and in their lives as adults.

Head Start was designed to prevent this cycle of failure. It offers a comprehensive, quality preschool experience for 3 and 4 year olds from poor families, and more recently, for children who are handicapped. It involves four components: education, health, social services, and a particularly key feature—parent involvement. Parent participation ensures continued interest in their child's educational progress throughout the school experience.

Since 1965, 9 million poor and handicapped children, and their families,

have benefited from Head Start. Over 25,000 of them are from New Orleans alone—my congressional district.

This year, more than 1,100 children are participating in the New Orleans Head Start Program—some of them are third generation Head Start Children! The director of the program, Pearlle Elloie, who has been with Head Start since its inception, says significant numbers of first generation children came to Head Start with anemia, parasite infestation, and exposure to tuberculosis. Third generation children, whose mothers and grandmothers were in Head Start, are far healthier and have better diets.

Studies also show, unequivocally, that Head Start children stay in school longer, have better job prospects, are less involved in crime, and have fewer pregnancies. In testimony before the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, Dr. David Weikart, director of the High/Scope Foundation, which evaluated quality, preschool education, told committee members the return on investment to society for each \$1 spent on programs such as Head Start is \$4.74.

Head Start is more than a cost-effective program, it is an investment in our Nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, I feel a personal exultation at the commemoration of Head Start's 20th anniversary. Twenty years ago, Lady Bird Johnson, who was the honorary chairman of the War on Poverty, invited me to the White House Conference on Head Start, and as I listened to all the experts, the educators, the pediatricians, the psychologists, and so on, I wondered why I had been invited by the First Lady to come to this conference. It was only in the question-and-answer period that followed the discussions that I discovered why I was there. People from all sorts of organizations from throughout the country complained that they had written or phoned in to express their interest and concern and their desire to help. As I was leaving the conference, I was confronted by Dr. Jules Richmond and by Diana MacArthur and asked, "What did you get out of the conference?"

I said, "I got out of it that tomorrow morning I have to go down and find those letters and make certain they are answered." That is how I became the National Voluntary Chairman of the Head Start Program. We were able to have the computer of the War on Poverty give us the 300 neediest counties in the United States, and in 6 weeks' time, with volunteer help from this city and from all over the country, we were able to establish Head Start centers in 267 of those counties.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with great love and pride and expectation that I urge my colleagues to vote in support of House Concurrent Resolution No. 95

commemorating the 20th anniversary of Head Start on May 18, 1985.

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, May 18 marks the 20th anniversary of the establishment of Project Head Start.

Twenty years ago, the Head Start Program was created as part of this Nation's war on poverty. We knew then, as we do today, that low-income children who suffer from poor nutrition, inadequate health care and understimulating environments are often ill-equipped to learn when they start school. Many fall behind, and far too many never catch up. From the very beginning, these children are denied an equal chance of success in school and in life.

By fostering cognitive and emotional development, as well as sound physical health, Head Start has helped grant an equal opportunity to over nine million of this Nation's most disadvantaged children.

Head Start began in 1965 as a small, 6-to-8 week summer program intended to serve 100,000 low-income children in 300 counties. But because of the enormous need for the program, and because school superintendents and community leaders supported it so enthusiastically, it was quickly expanded to serve 560,000 children in 2,300 communities. In that first summer, 240 of the 300 poorest counties developed Head Start programs.

Today, Head Start is a comprehensive, year-round early childhood enrichment program serving 442,000 children. In California alone, nearly 33,000 children are served and in my congressional district, Contra Costa County, over 600 low-income preschool children are helped every day toward a brighter future through Head Start.

The program has been particularly instrumental in providing equal opportunities to minority children and children with special needs. Sixty-eight percent of Head Start's enrollment consists of black, Hispanic, Asian, and native American children. Over 55,000 handicapped children are enrolled in Head Start, and more than 25 percent of these children are multiply handicapped.

Much of Head Start's strength stems from the extensive involvement of parents. For every four children involved in the program, at least three parents are providing voluntary service, including work on parent-policy committees and in the classroom. Of the over 80,000 persons employed in Head Start programs, 29 percent are parents of current or former Head Start children.

Using any measure, Head Start has been a success. Head Start children score better than comparable non-Head Start children on standardized achievement tests, and are less likely to fail a grade, dropout of school or require special education. They are also

more likely to be of normal height and weight, with fewer absences from school due to illness.

The greatest gains from Head Start have come to those children most in need—those whose mothers have less than an 11th grade education and those who came to the program with the lowest intelligence test scores.

Head Start is also a very cost-effective program. Results from the longitudinal evaluation of the High/Scope Perry Preschool Program, which were presented in testimony to the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, show that for every \$1 invested in high quality early childhood education programs like Head Start, \$4.75 is saved in lower special education costs, lower welfare and law enforcement costs, and higher worker productivity.

Yet despite Head Start's proven success, only about 20 percent of all eligible, low income preschool children are served. One thousand counties in this country have no Head Start Program. If we freeze Head Start's budget for fiscal year 1986 as the administration has proposed, 19,000 fewer children will be served than are currently served, and 19,000 fewer doors to opportunity will be opened.

Head Start's success is clear, but the job is far from over. There are over 5 million children under 6 living in poverty today, 1 million more than just 5 years ago. This fact alone testifies to the enormous need for Head Start to continue and expand. It became clear from the Select Committee's year-long bipartisan National Initiative on Child Care, culminating in our report, "Families and Child Care: Improving the Options," that Congress should annually increase the numbers of children served by Head Start.

We must remember, though, that in any future expansion of Head Start, it is vitally important that the full range of Head Start services continue to be provided. Much of Head Start's success stems from the fact that in addition to high quality early education, the program offers extensive medical, dental and mental health services, immunization services, and nutritious meals as well as training and social service assistance for parents. Low-income preschool children need the full Head Start package.

In commemorating the 20th anniversary of Head Start, we also commemorate our decision, as a nation, to invest in our own future by investing in our children. As we now see the benefits of two decades of success in helping millions of low-income children achieve their full potential, the wisdom of that decision is clear.

Head Start deserves the strong support of all of the Members of Congress. I urge my colleagues to reaffirm our commitment to this proven effective

program, and work toward its expansion. ●

● Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, very few of us were here 20 years ago when the Head Start Program was begun, but all of us have come to recognize its extraordinary success in providing services to meet the educational and health needs of low-income children.

The program has been in effect long enough for us to clearly see the benefits of participation in Head Start. The children from that first Head Start class in 1965 are now college graduates, members of the work force, tax-paying citizens. And those who have come behind them—9 million in all—show signs of similar success due to the exceptional preparation they received before elementary school.

But it is not only the children who have benefited. One of the hallmarks of the Head Start Program has been parental involvement—as board members, volunteer assistants and paid staff. This involvement has provided much needed boosts in self-esteem for the parents and has helped many of them become more self-sufficient.

And beyond the children and the parents, society as a whole has benefited. These children have become—or will in the future—our employees, our Nation's voters. Our Nation benefits from their improved health—in terms of increased productivity and decreased expenditures for health care—and from their education—in terms of their ability to hold down jobs and not be dependent on public assistance.

I am delighted to join with my colleagues in celebrating the 20th anniversary of this highly successful and cost-effective program. I hope we will continue to celebrate many more Head Start anniversaries in the years ahead. ●

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to rise, along with my colleague on the Education and Labor Committee, Representative DALE KILDEE, in support of House Concurrent Resolution 95, commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Head Start Program, and House Concurrent Resolution 132, commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act. Both of these human needs programs are targeted at the most vulnerable groups of people in our society, the very young and the very old.

Head Start is often looked upon as the "crown jewel" of the Great Society programs enacted during the Johnson administration in the 1960's. Head Start has provided much-needed health, nutrition, educational and social services to hundreds of thousands of our Nation's poorest children over the last 20 years. Unfortunately, current funding levels allow only about 20 percent of the children eligible to participate in the program, leaving some 2 million youngsters without the benefits the program provides.

Statistics show that the Head Start Program is cost effective, both for individuals as well as for society as a whole. Head Start gives disadvantaged children a boost as they enter school and prevents far more costly services later due to juvenile delinquency, illiteracy or welfare dependency. Longitudinal studies have shown that children who have participated in Head Start achieve higher grades in school and are less likely to require special or remedial education. These same students also graduate from high school at a much higher rate and are more likely to secure gainful employment later in life. Head Start participants also have lower arrest and pregnancy rates than their peers who have not had the advantages the Head Start can provide. I believe continued support for this program is vital to improve the chances that our young people will be adequately nurtured, educated, trained and ready to face the challenges of the future.

Another sound investment of tax dollars is found in the variety of social service programs authorized by the Older Americans Act. We have a moral responsibility to ensure the well-being of our older citizens. The services provided by the act are targeted to meet the special needs of the elderly in the areas of income, health, housing, employment, retirement, and community services.

For example, under the act senior citizen centers are maintained for the care and companionship of the elderly; nutrition and health assistance programs are made available; home-delivered meals and other vital services are provided to those elderly who are homebound; employment programs for low-income older persons are provided in senior nutrition centers, children's hospitals, State parks, libraries and State and local community service agencies; in addition, the act authorizes training, research, and demonstration programs in the field of aging, such as research on Alzheimer's disease, legal services for older persons, home heating assistance, and other projects designed to improve the livelihood of the elderly and give them greater independence and dignity.

I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on these two important resolutions which acknowledge and reinforce our commitment to the nurturing of our young citizens and to the continued support for our senior citizens. ●

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives gave official recognition to one of this Nation's most successful antipoverty programs by passing a concurrent resolution commemorating the 20th anniversary of Head Start. I believe that it is most fitting for the House to pause and reflect on the success of this program and the impact it has had on dis-

advantaged young children over the past two decades.

When originally conceived, Head Start was to be an 8-week summer project for low-income preschool children. Since that time the program has grown to become a comprehensive year-round program addressing the health, nutrition, social and educational needs of children from some of the Nation's poorest families. Head Start has also become a national leader among preschool programs in the mainstreaming of handicapped children.

During the last 20 years over 9 million children have benefited from the Head Start Program. Studies have shown that these Head Start children are less likely to require remedial education and are more likely to graduate from high school and find employment than their counterparts who did not have the benefit of attending a preschool program. Children enrolled in Head Start also receive medical screening and care more often than disadvantaged children who are not enrolled in Head Start.

Today Head Start is serving 430,000 children nationwide. In my home State of Maine 1,669 children are currently enrolled in federally funded Head Start Programs in 13 agencies across the State. It is gratifying to know that Head Start will give these children an improved opportunity to grow up healthy, well-educated and socially well adjusted.●

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as an original sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 95, I rise in strong support of the resolution. I want to thank my good friend Gus HAWKINS, the Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, for agreeing to list me as an original sponsor of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 95 commemorates the twentieth anniversary of the Head Start Program. On May 18, 1965, President Johnson announced the establishment of the tremendously successful Head Start Program, a preschool child development program conceived not so much as a Federal effort, but as a neighborhood effort. Children of poverty get a "head start" on their future under the program by receiving preschool training to prepare them for regular school in the fall. They get medical and dental attention that they badly need and parents receive counseling on improving the home environment.

Head Start is clearly one of the most successful, cost-effective and popular programs ever established by the Federal Government. Today's resolution reaffirms Congress' commitment to this outstanding program. What began in the summer of 1965 as a 6-8 week demonstration project was soon transformed into a program which has served some nine million low income

preschool children since its creation. Today, more than 400,000 children are enrolled in Head Start programs throughout the Nation.

On the 15th anniversary of Head Start, one report indicated that when such factors as reduced cost of special education and remedial services were considered, Head Start's benefits outweighed its costs by 236 percent. The students score higher on mathematics and reading tests, and tend to show stronger achievement orientation than non-Head Start children.

Mr. Speaker, on this 20th anniversary of Head Start, it is prudent to recall the words of President Johnson when the program was established. "Five- and six-year-old children are inheritors of poverty's curse, and not its creators," he said. "Unless we act, these children will pass it on to the next generation, like a family birthmark." And in paying tribute to Head Start volunteers, President Johnson said that "the bread that they cast upon these waters will surely return many thousandfold."

Today, we commend these volunteers and this program for its benefits over the years. I'm proud to join my colleagues in doing so.●

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, 20 years have passed since President Johnson launched Project Head Start as part of his war on poverty. Based on the theory that early childhood is the most critical period of a child's education and that young children growing up in poverty would learn better if their basic emotional, medical, nutritional, and educational needs were met, Head Start was designed to provide that opportunity. Originally just a summer program serving over half a million children, it has grown in funding from \$96.4 million to almost \$1.1 billion.

Despite rugged times in the past, Congress last year overwhelmingly granted Head Start a 2 year reauthorization. Even this administration, which has been openly critical of a number of social programs, has come to recognize the importance of Head Start—which now serves 448,250 students, 90 percent of whom are below the poverty line. Yet, there remain over one thousand counties in the United States who do not participate in Head Start, primarily for reasons of inadequate funding.

In my district of southwest Washington for example, an area with record level unemployment and obvious need, three of the most desperate counties are without Head Start programs. Start up funds for new programs are simply inadequate. The opportunity to make up for the disadvantages of background, fundamental to the idea behind the Head Start Program, is being lost for those children and for thousands of others around the coun-

try, because of poorly considered budget priorities.

Twenty years ago, Lady Byrd Johnson, honorary chair of Project Head Start, speaking about these children of poverty, said: "There is no more important task in our communities than for such children to hear a voice say, 'Come take my hand!'" I hope that over the next 20 years we can still make that hand available to needy children and in an even more generous way than we have been able to do so far.●

● Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the past 20 years, over 9 million children from low-income families have been given a chance to have an equal opportunity at life, a chance to begin at the same starting line as other children lucky to have been born into families with a little more money, stability, or time to properly care for their children.

This week marks the 20th anniversary of the Federal program responsible for giving these disadvantaged children the proper nutrition, education, medical, and emotional support they may have otherwise missed in their early years of development. That program is Project Head Start, a comprehensive developmental program that gives preschool children from low-income families the "head start" they need in order to begin elementary school at the same level of development as their peers from higher income families or a more stable homelife.

Since the program's earliest days, it has proven to be one of the most successful social programs to be administered by the Federal Government. Instead of being left at home unattended, children participating in Head Start are given the chance to go to preschool where they are taught to read and learn to better interact with other children under the supervision of trained adults. The program guarantees these children well-balanced meals as well as medical and dental treatment their families often are too poor to afford.

Studies have shown that these services, provided at such an early and important stage of development, have improved the quality of life, health and educational achievements or poverty-stricken children, over a period of many years.

According to one recent study, children who participated in Head Start preschool programs performed equal to or better than their peers when they began elementary school. There were notable improvements on the children's standardized tests in reading, language, and math, and it was shown that these children were more likely to go on to vocational or academic training after high school.

A particularly important finding was that children who participated in Head Start were less likely to be misclassified as mentally retarded or in need of special education, as is often the case of other economically disadvantaged children who do not receive such preschool education and social services. The study also found that the advantages gained by preschoolers continue into adulthood where they are more likely to be employed by higher paying jobs with greater job satisfaction.

The social impacts of the program extend beyond the child to the family and community. Single parents have been able to find work while their children attend school during the day. In addition, studies have reported a more positive relationship between parents and children as well as an increase in parent participation in the child's future education. The communities also benefit from the children being in school where they are less likely to get into trouble on the streets.

In its 20-year history, Head Start has proven its immeasurable worth to society. It's also cost effective—for every \$1,000 invested in preschool education, at least \$4,000 is saved in social service costs. Over 8,000 needy children in Missouri are currently participating in Head Start programs and, as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I will be working to see that they continue to receive the important services provided by this invaluable program.●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, one of the cornerstones of the Great Society was laid when President Johnson signed the bill enacting the Head Start Program.

In recent years, it has become fashionable to attack many of the social programs that were enacted in those days. Some of those programs have perhaps outlived their usefulness, others may need to be modified. But for 20 years Head Start has lived up to and exceeded the expectations we had when we inaugurated it in 1965.

There is a popular notion now that the Federal Government cannot effectively administer programs that deal with the social needs of the people. The new wisdom says that only the private sector or government on the most local level should deal with matters of health, education, and social welfare.

For two decades Head Start has been proving this theory wrong. Unquestionably, some matters are better left to private groups and local government, but this should not exclude the Federal Government from playing a role in this area. Study after study has shown that children from disadvantaged backgrounds who participated in Head Start Programs, have scholastically outperformed their peers who did not.

Certainly in light of our huge Federal deficit, we need to reexamine all federally funded programs and make reductions in all parts of the budget. We must be careful however, not to dismantle the many worthwhile programs that have consistently paid dividends over the years. We should also not shy away from new programs. Government can play a role in helping its citizens improve their quality of life. Head Start is a shining example of what government can do when it applies its resources thoughtfully and imaginatively to the social needs of the society.●

● Mrs. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I stand before the House today, to show my total support of the highly successful Head Start Program, as the House commemorates its 20th anniversary and Congress reaffirms its commitment to the program.

Originally designed as an 8 week project under the Economic Opportunity Act, Head Start is now a year-round program of comprehensive services to address the health, nutrition, social, and educational needs of some of the Nation's poorest children and their families. Head Start has provided services to over 9 million disadvantaged youngsters since 1965, and has proved to be one of the most popular, cost effective, and enduring of the Federal Government's antipoverty programs.

Head Start gives disadvantaged children a better chance as they enter school and helps parents become more actively involved in their children's education and development. A follow-up of 820 Head Start children showed gains in school performance lasting as long as 13 years. With regard to key parental involvement, one-third of all Head Start staff are parents of current and former students. For every 15 children participating in Head Start, 10 parents provide volunteer services to the program.

The need for continued support for Head Start is evidenced by the fact that less than 18 percent of eligible children are being served at this time. Over 430,000 children participated in the program last year. In my own district, the Head Start Program has been a tremendous success, serving the needs of more than 40,000 deserving children. Next week I will again voice my support as I attend the first annual Combined Head Start Graduation in Ville Platte, LA, where I will witness at first hand the benefits of such an essential program as I speak to the graduates and their families.

Mr. Speaker, again I am proud to show my support for the Head Start Program as I pledge to ensure that such programs remain intact and continue to develop.●

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Louisiana

[Mrs. Boggs] for her very moving testimony.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 95.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent Resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1985.

OBSERVING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 132) observing the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 132

Whereas 1985 marks the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965;

Whereas over its 20-year history, the Older Americans Act of 1965 has provided important social and human services to tens of millions of older individuals in their communities, helping to promote greater independence for them and maintaining their dignity;

Whereas one of the key elements contributing to the successful implementation of the Older Americans Act of 1965 during this 20-year period was the establishment of the "aging network" which consists of State and area agencies on aging, as well as congregate and home delivered nutrition providers and other supportive service providers;

Whereas the Administration on Aging, created by the Act, has served as a purposeful advocate for the concerns and needs of older individuals;

Whereas the Act has provided important funds for research, training, and demonstration programs to improve, expand, and enhance services to older individuals;

Whereas the Act has provided important part-time community service employment opportunities for low-income older individuals, many of whom work in providing services to other older individuals;

Whereas the Act has sought to address the special needs of older American Indians through grants to Indian tribes;

Whereas the programs and services provided under the Act have been more successful because of the contributing role of volunteers;

Whereas the Act has periodically been amended by Congress in recognition of the changing needs of our rapidly aging society; and

Whereas the Older Americans Act of 1965 serves as a model for the development of community-based services which provided alternatives to institutionalization of older individuals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965 and the successful implementation of such Act;

(2) acknowledges the many and varied contributions by all levels of the aging network and recognizes that the Act has achieved its mandate to the extent that it has because of the day to day work performed by the aging network; and

(3) reaffirms its support for the Older Americans Act of 1965 and its primary goal of providing services to maintain the dignity and promote the independence of older individuals in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On behalf of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am pleased to bring before the House for consideration today, House Concurrent Resolution 132, to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act. This bill was introduced by my colleague, Congressman MARIO BIAGGI, together with 73 original cosponsors. I understand a number of additional Members have since joined in supporting the measure.

House Concurrent Resolution 132 commemorates the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965, and acknowledges the many contributions of workers, both paid and volunteer, who have successfully implemented this act. The measure also reaffirms Congress' com-

mitment to maintaining the independence and dignity of older individuals.

I have always believed that government's prime role is to promote, defend, and enhance human dignity. Meals on Wheels and other Older Americans Act programs certainly enhance, promote, and defend human dignity for they enable many people to remain in their homes rather than in convalescent or extended care facilities. In addition, these programs enable many others to be active contributors to their communities.

The Older Americans Act has more than lived up to its purpose of developing new and improved programs to help older persons. The aging network created under the act provides a full range of services and programs to meet the needs of older people in their own communities. In specific terms, in 1985:

More than 212 million meals will be served in senior centers and delivered to those homebound;

More than 9 million older individuals will receive home health visits, transportation, and other important services;

And 62,500 title V workers will be making important contributions in children's hospitals, senior nutrition centers, State parks, libraries, and other community sites.

At the time President Johnson signed the Older Americans Act into law, he stated the act "clearly affirms our Nation's high sense of responsibility toward the well-being of older citizens."

This program has long enjoyed strong, bipartisan support. I urge that we reaffirm that support on this 20th anniversary.

□ 1320

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, May has been designated "Older Americans Month," and I believe it is therefore fitting for us to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act, which is the cornerstone of our national policy on aging. The act embodies the key Federal programs serving the social and nutritional needs of our Nation's elderly.

In just two decades, a network of nutrition and social services has emerged as a result of the Older Americans Act. This network of services now touches the lives of senior citizens in nearly every community in the Nation.

The Older Americans Act has been recognized as one of the most effective pieces of legislation to be developed by Congress. In the reauthorization of the act last year, I had the opportunity to review the full range of services and programs which have evolved under the act and which continue to

meet the needs of older people in their own communities.

These programs serve to maintain the independence and dignity of our senior citizens. The act is designed and has been a critical element in helping to avoid unnecessary and premature institutionalization for those elderly who can receive services in their homes and communities through a network of service providers.

The Older Americans Act has enjoyed bipartisan support of administrations and Congresses since its inception. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 132, to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act and to reaffirm our support for the act and for the people it serves.

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as the author of this resolution I urge its passage by the House today. I regret that the death of my dear friend and trusted adviser Anthony Petretti causes me to be absent today.

I wish to first thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources, Mr. KILDEE, for his invaluable assistance in gaining such expeditious consideration of this resolution. In addition, I wish to thank the chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. HAWKINS, and the ranking minority member, Mr. JEFFORDS, for their support of this resolution and their longstanding support of the program we salute with this resolution—the Older Americans Act.

My resolution which I am proud to say has been cosponsored by 132 of my colleagues on a bipartisan basis acknowledges a very important anniversary which occurs this year. I refer to the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act and its various programs and services. This resolution pays a special tribute to the so-called aging network which is in fact the motor which operates the Older Americans Act at the Federal, State, and local level. I will discuss their contributions later in this statement.

The Older Americans Act born during the Great Society of the 1960's has matured effectively in that decade and into the next and continues to succeed in this time when we have effectively seen the "baby boom" replaced by the "senior boom." Today we see the number of elderly in our Nation rising at a rapid rate to the extent that we now have more people over 60 than under 10 for the first time in our Nation's history. The passage of the Older Americans Act in 1965 was the direct outgrowth of a recommendation offered by the first White House on Aging convened under President Kennedy in 1961. Its passage signified the emergence of aging as a major national policy area and served to stimulate increased public in-

terest and attention to the needs of older Americans. It was established in response to what was identified at that time as a lack of community based social services for older persons. It was determined then and reaffirmed through amendments through the years that providing these social and human services would keep a number of these seniors out of costly nursing homes and within their community.

In fact if one were to identify the key mission of the Older Americans Act it is to provide those elderly in the greatest economic and social need with an array of human service programs which will assist them in maintaining their dignity and independence within their homes and their communities.

It has been my distinct pleasure and privilege to have been closely associated with the Older Americans Act throughout my 16 years in the House of Representatives. I have been on the Education and Labor Committee since my election to Congress and this is the committee of responsibility for the act. In that capacity I have been associated with eight of the nine series of amendments which have been offered to improve the original act. I have seen these amendments produce substantive reforms in the programs which led to the establishment of the congregate and home delivered meals programs as well as the official establishment of the aging network.

I have also been closely associated with the Older Americans Act in an oversight capacity by virtue of my service on the House Select Committee on Aging. I am an original member of this committee and since 1977 have served as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources which has among its area of jurisdiction the Older Americans Act.

To appreciate the Older Americans Act is to know people who work at its programs as well as those seniors who receive its services. I have had the good fortune to know many of both groups in my congressional career. I have worked closely with State agencies on aging, area agencies on aging, nutrition project directors, both congregate and home delivered as well as a myriad of other individuals who are vital in the aging network. Essential to the success of the Older Americans Act have been all of the aging organizations which make up the leadership and backbone of the act itself. These include the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging, the National Association of State Units on Aging, the National Association of Nutrition and Aging Services Programs and the National Association of Meal Providers as well as the title V contractors: The National Council of Senior Citizens, American Association of Retired Persons, the Gray Panthers, The Retired Senior Volunteer Program, the National Senior Citizens Law Center,

The National Association of Retired Federal Employees, Meals on Wheels, the Gerontological Society of America, the Senior Companion Program, Association for Gerontology in Higher Education, The National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, the National Interfaith Coalition on Aging, NCCBA, NICA, AAHA, WGS, NAOAVPD, the Older Women's League, ASFCs, RMDUAW, National Council on Aging, ANPPM and NP/ARCA, and many more leadership organizations with whom I have been in close and constant contact.

As part of the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act, the Subcommittee on Human Services is preparing a report on the Older Americans Act. It will feature observations and statements from those who have made singular and important contributions to the act during its history.

These include:

Ms. Eleanor Cain, Director of the Division on Aging, Department of Health and Social Services.

Mr. Charles Reed, Director of the Bureau of Aging and Adult Services, Department of Social and Health Services.

Mr. Daniel A. Quirk.

Mr. Donald Riley.

Ms. Katherine Morrison, Administration on Aging.

Ms. Charlotte Frank, Administration on Aging.

Mr. Gene Handlesman, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Development Services.

Mr. Charles Wells, Deputy Commissioner on Aging, Administration on Aging.

Mr. Arthur Flemming.

Ms. Betty Brake, ACTION.

Ms. Elizabeth B. Douglass, Executive Director, Association for Gerontology in Higher Education (AGHE).

Mr. Cyril Brickfield, Chairman, Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, c/o American Association of Retired Persons.

Mr. Wayne Moore, Director, Legal Counsel for the Elderly.

Mr. Jonathon A. Weiss, Executive Director, Legal Services for the Elderly.

Mr. C.C. Clinkscale III, National Director, National Alliance of Senior Citizens.

Mr. Samuel J. Simmons, President, National Caucus and Center on Black Aged.

Mr. Jack Ossosky, Executive Director, National Council on the Aging.

Ms. Jacquelyne J. Jackson, Director, National Council on the Black Aging.

Mr. William R. Hutton, Executive Director, National Council of Senior Citizens.

Mr. Burton Fretz, Executive Director, National Senior Citizens Law Center.

Ms. Carmela G. Lacayo, Executive Director, Association Nacional Pro Personas Mayores.

Mr. John M. Cornman, Executive Director, Gerontological Society of America.

Mr. Thomas Bergen, Executive Director, National Geriatrics Society.

Mr. William D. Bechill, University of Maryland at Baltimore School of Social Work and Community Planning.

Mr. John B. Martin.

Mr. Robert C. Benedict, Pennsylvania Health Care Association.

Ms. Lennie-Marie Toliver.

Ms. Rose Dubroff, Executive Director, Brookdale Center on Aging of Hunter College.

Ms. Janet S. Sainer, Commissioner, New York City Department for the Aging.

Ms. Roberta R. Spohn, Deputy Commissioner, New York City Department for the Aging.

The Honorable Margaret Heckler, Department of Health and Human Services.

Mr. Nelson H. Cruikshank.

Monsignor Charles Fahey, Third Age Center, Fordham University.

Ms. Adelaide Attard, Department of Senior Citizens Affairs.

Ms. Edna (Bonny) Russell.

Mr. Robert Robinson.

Mr. Harry Walker.

Mr. Gerald Bloedow, Executive Director of the Board on Aging.

The Honorable Roman C. Pucinski.

The Honorable Lister Hill.

The Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Jr., Office of the Attorney General, State Capitol, Ohio.

The Honorable John W. Gardner.

The Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen.

The Honorable Robert H. Finch, Fleming, Anderson, McClung & Finch.

The Honorable Elliot L. Richardson, Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy.

The Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger, Department of Defense.

The Honorable F. David Mathews, Charles F. Kettering Foundation.

The Honorable Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Califano, Ross & Heineman.

The Honorable John Brademas, New York University.

The Honorable Ogden R. Reid, Ophir Hill.

The Honorable Edward M. Kennedy.

The Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton.

The Honorable Jeremiah Denton.

The Honorable Orrin G. Hatch.

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley.

The Honorable Ike Andrews.

Mr. William Moyer, President, National Association for Nutrition and Aging Services Programs.

Ms. Shelley Berger, President, National Association of Meals Programs, Lutheran Social Service Society of West Pennsylvania.

Mr. Paul Sheppard, University of Maryland Center on Aging.

Ms. Fran Butler, EMJ Consultants.

The Honorable Richard S. Schweiker, American Council Life Insurance.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, a vote for this resolution is likely to be a vote appreciated by a constituent, since practically every congressional district in the Nation has one or more component of the aging network within it as well as part of the millions of seniors who participate in programs under the Older Americans Act. I urge favorable consideration today. ●

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 132 commemorating the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act.

Twenty years ago, in a bold stroke, Congress recognized that the growth of the aging population would require the establishment of a national policy. As the number of older persons grew, it was recognized that the limited resources were not enough to provide for

the needs of the vulnerable aged. Nor were the elderly getting a proportional amount when compared to other age groups. It was in this environment that the Older Americans Act was first conceptualized.

Over the past two decades, the Older Americans Act has become a focal point for the development of a comprehensive, coordinated system for service delivery to the elderly. It has enabled older persons to remain self-sufficient by providing services that permit them to remain in the community and to function at a level consistent with their ability.

What began as a few small service grants and research projects has grown into a system which administers social services in 57 States and territories and in 660 localities. Appropriations have increased from around \$6.5 million in fiscal year 1966 to over \$1 billion in 1985, all of which is designed to meet the social services needs of older persons.

As the program has developed, so has our understanding of the needs of older persons. Special emphasis has been placed on services which break down barriers of all types, such as transportation which assures adequate access to services; legal services which provides older persons with a means of advocating for their rights; and in-home services which enables the elderly to remain in their home setting rather than being institutionalized.

As is the case with all responsive programs, the Older Americans Act has changed as the needs of the elderly have changed. In November of 1983, in a bill I introduced, priority was given to education grant proposals for students who study the custodial or skilled care of victims of Alzheimer's disease. As a result of these provisions, there is a pool of trained personnel who will be available to work in settings such as home health agencies, adult day care centers, senior centers, nursing homes, and veterans' hospitals in the care of those who suffer from this debilitating illness.

There are also education and demonstration projects specifically with the victims of Alzheimer's disease and their families in mind. These provide for respite and community based care services which serve to reinforce the roles of the State area agencies in providing services to care-giving families.

In yet another change in 1984, the House Education and Labor Committee included a second bill that I introduced. This bill increased authorization levels for title III-B supportive services and senior centers. These programs include the critical transportation, in-home, and adult day care programs. The purpose of these community-based programs is to delay or prevent institutionalization by providing alternatives.

Currently, title III-B has grown as more title III-C moneys have been diverted to pay for the increased demand for social services. With the implementation of the diagnosis related groups [DRG's] reimbursement system, many persons being discharged into the community are sicker and more vulnerable than has been true in the past. As never before, the need for an adequate system of social services is becoming apparent. Home health benefits are more in demand than ever as are the need for respite and day care.

As we celebrate the 20th birthday of the Older Americans Act, it is clear that we have before us the challenge to continue to provide the same high quality of services, to continue to provide alternatives to institutionalization, and to continue to assure that our older citizens reap the value of the contributions they have made to our society.

● **Mr. ROYBAL.** Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Select Committee on Aging, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of this Chamber, both past and present, who have been vigilant in their support of the Older Americans Act and the elderly citizens of our great Nation; 1985 marks the 20th anniversary of the passage of the Older Americans Act. This landmark legislation continues to be the primary source of social service delivery to millions of older Americans. Over the last 20 years, the programs and services which have been established through this act have enhanced the quality of life for seniors. These programs have provided the basic supportive and nutritional services needed by many older persons to help them remain active and live independently with dignity.

Since the passage of the Older Americans Act, 672 area agencies on aging have been established throughout the country to help coordinate services to our Nation's senior citizens. It is estimated that 9.3 million elderly currently benefit from services such as in home and adult day care, and congregate and home delivered meals.

These successful programs have proven, time and time again, to be effective in preventing premature institutionalization. However, it is my firm belief that there still is much work to be done. During this time of budget restraint, I must emphasize that Older Americans Act programs have already sustained their share of budget cuts.

Three main factors are placing an increasing burden on limited Older Americans Act dollars: First, the increase in early hospital discharges associated with the Medicare prospective payment system; second, the increasing demand for supportive and long-term care services because of cutbacks in other programs, and third, the increasing number of persons who need

assistance. We must also remember that as the elderly population increases, the need for these services will continue to grow as well. The U.S. Census Bureau projects that the population age 65 and older will increase by 100 percent between 1980 and the year 2020, compared to an increase of only 21 percent for the population under age 65.

It is particularly appropriate that we celebrate the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act during May, which has been designated as "Older Americans Month." Again, as chairman of the Aging Committee, I wish to thank those in this body who through the years have supported the Older Americans Act, its goals and objectives. I think that the Congress should be proud of their efforts and the success of this legislation on the occasion of its 20th anniversary.

● **Mr. LIGHTFOOT.** Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 132, and as a member of the Select Committee on Aging, I rise today in strong support of this resolution to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act of 1965. This resolution will reaffirm our commitment to the well-being of older Americans.

The Older Americans Act has provided important social and human services to older individuals. It has improved the lives of older Americans in the areas of income, health, housing, employment, retirement, and community services. One of the most important features of the act is the establishment of an aging network which consists of State and area agencies on aging, as well as congregate and home delivered nutrition providers and other supportive services.

This network is providing more than 9 million older Americans with a variety of supportive services. For example, 212 million meals will be served during this year. The title V Community Employment Program currently supports 62,502 employment positions in children's hospitals, senior nutrition centers, State parks, libraries, and State and local governments. And the title VI program assists 83 Indian tribal organizations to better serve their older members.

With an ever increasing older population, it will be even more important for us to analyze and acknowledge the needs of older Americans and to provide services and programs which will ensure their health and well-being. I believe that the Older Americans Act has done an exceptional job at meeting many of these needs. This can be shown by the strong bipartisan support this act has received from my colleagues over its 20-year history.

● **Mr. PEPPER.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to speak in favor of House Concurrent Resolu-

tion 132, to observe and formally recognize the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act.

This resolution, which was proposed by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable MARIO BIAGGI, salutes the success the Older Americans Act has enjoyed over the past two decades.

The Older Americans Act, enacted by the Congress in 1965, has proved to be one of this country's most effective pieces of legislation. The act provides for a full range of services and programs that fill the needs of older people in their own communities—senior center and nutrition programs, home-delivered meals for the homebound and employment opportunities for low-income older individuals. In addition, the act finances research, training, and demonstration programs designed to develop better ways to meet the needs of the elderly.

The proposed resolution, it should be noted, also pays special tribute to the aging network established under the Older Americans Act—a component which exists in each and every congressional district in the United States and has proved so important through the years.

The mission of the Older Americans Act is to provide those elderly in the greatest social and economic need with an array of social and human services which will help them maintain their independence and dignity. It has, for two decades, faithfully met that charge. It is with great pleasure that I endorse House Concurrent Resolution 132 saluting the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act. I urge all my colleagues committed to America's elderly to do the same.●

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 132, I rise in strong support of this resolution. The resolution commemorates the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act.

Mr. Speaker, on July 14, 1965, President Johnson signed the Older Americans Act into law, saying that the act "clearly affirms our Nation's high sense of responsibility toward the well-being of older citizens." This act was designed specifically to address the needs of older people.

Mr. Speaker, the Older Americans Act is the major vehicle for organization and delivery of services solely to senior citizens, services tailored to meet their special needs. Today, it is a program supporting 662 area agencies on aging and 57 State agencies. The network provides a full range of services to senior citizens: from senior centers, nutrition programs, and home-delivered meals to other services for the homebound, and employment opportunities for the elderly.

It is estimated that this year, more than 9 million older persons will be receiving a variety of supportive services. Over 212 million meals will be served

to the elderly. The Community Employment Program supports 62,502 employment positions in children's hospitals, senior nutrition centers, State parks, libraries, and State and local governments.

The Older Americans Act is perhaps most important because it recognizes the worth and benefit of our Nation's senior citizens. It sends them a message that they will not be forgotten—not those who have done so much to make our Nation what it is today.

Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of the Older Americans Act, I believe that it is important for Congress to both recognize its accomplishments and benefits, and to reaffirm our commitment to it. I urge my colleagues to support me in this recognition and reaffirmation.●

● Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in the House in passing House Concurrent Resolution 132, legislation commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act.

Since its passage in 1965 the Older Americans Act has helped millions of our Nation's senior citizens to live their lives with honor and dignity. It has improved the quality of their lives through a wide variety of health, housing, nutrition, employment, and community service programs. These services are provided through a network of 57 State agencies and 662 area agencies.

Perhaps the best known of the Older Americans Act programs are its nutrition programs like Meals on Wheels which will provide 212 million meals this year to senior citizens at senior centers and through home delivery. These programs are instrumental in allowing senior citizens to maintain their independent lives. In the long run they save the taxpayer millions of dollars by allowing seniors to live outside more expensive facilities like nursing homes. In Luzerne County, PA, some 350 senior citizens receive home delivered meals every day through a program funded in part by the Older Americans Act.

The title V senior employment programs will employ an estimated 62,500 senior citizens around the Nation in hospitals, nutrition centers, State parks, libraries, and other community service centers. In addition to providing income and a sense of self-worth to the seniors who are employed through these programs, they also help to provide essential social services to other senior citizens. Title V helps seniors to aid each other.

Some 9 million senior citizens also receive home health care visits through the Older Americans Act. Like the nutrition programs, the home health care program helps senior citizens maintain their independent lives. This program is particularly important in northeastern Pennsylvania.

Roughly 1,000 senior citizens in Luzerne County receive light housekeeping, bathing, and other homemaker services through programs funded in part by the Older Americans Act. An additional 1,500 senior citizens have minor, but important, home repairs and other chores performed each year through Older Americans Act programs.

For those individuals who need more care than homemaker services can provide, but who do not need to be institutionalized, the Older Americans Act also helps to fund adult day care programs. The Luzerne County Area Agency on Aging advises me that 30 to 40 senior citizens in Luzerne County are currently benefiting from these services.

Mr. Speaker, all too often we hear only about Government programs that don't work. It is both fitting and appropriate that we pay tribute to the Older Americans Act, a program that has worked, and worked well, for two decades. Everyone who has had a part in the creation of the Older Americans Act, and the delivery of its services, deserves our heartfelt thanks and congratulations.●

● Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 132, of which I am an original cosponsor. House Concurrent Resolution 132 recognizes the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act.

Since its enactment in 1965, the Older Americans Act has benefited the lives of millions of older Americans. The act was established to maintain the dignity and promote the independence of older individuals in the United States. For the past 20 years, the Older Americans Act has successfully achieved its important mandate. This has been accomplished through the establishment of the "aging network," consisting of State and area agencies on aging, through the establishment of congregate nutrition sites across the Nation, by providing important funds for research and training, and with the involvement and hard work of dedicated volunteers.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the resolution, which not only commends the important ideals behind the act, but also reaffirms congressional support for these programs which benefit constituents in every congressional district in the United States.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my dear friend and colleague from New York [Mr. BIAGGI], for authoring this important bill. I have enjoyed working with him on this legislation and I look forward to continuing our work to protect the interests of our Nation's seniors. In addition, I commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], for his excel-

lent work in managing this legislation.●

● Mrs. LONG. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to address the House today, to voice my support for the Older Americans Act, as the House commemorates the 20th anniversary of the act and Congress reaffirms its commitment to maintaining the independence and dignity of older individuals.

In representing a district in which approximately 15 percent of the population is over 65, I know the importance of the programs which come under the Older Americans Act. From a few small programs in the first year of implementation, the act now provides a full range of services and programs to meet the needs of older people in their own communities. Paid and volunteer workers will serve more than 212 million meals this year for senior centers and homebound individuals. More than 9 million older Americans will benefit from home health visits, transportation, and other services.

The Older Americans Act program has developed from a few small grants in 1966 to a program supporting 662 area agencies on aging and 57 State agencies. Whether it be the senior woman in Gonzales who receives lunch every day or the older man in Alexandria who is provided with home health visits, many people in Louisiana's Eighth Congressional District have benefited from such an essential piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am proud to show my support for the Older Americans Act and I pledge to continue to work to ensure the independence and dignity for our growing numbers of older Americans. As President Johnson stated in 1965 when he signed the Older Americans Act into law, "such an act clearly affirms our Nation's high sense of responsibility toward the well-being of older Americans."●

● Mr. GROTEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support and as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 132, commending the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act. As one who has been active in senior citizen matters all of my life, I believe the Congress should recognize the anniversary of the signing of the 1965 Older Americans Act. For several years before I came to the House, I served as a consultant for the Lutheran Social Services of Illinois and managed the Hotel Baker in my hometown, St. Charles, IL. The Hotel Baker had been converted into a senior residency in 1971 and is owned and operated by the Lutheran Social Services. My experiences with the seniors there, throughout my State legislative district and now in my congressional district have been extremely rewarding. I take this opportunity to add my congratulations to those who had the

foresight to pass this legislation 20 years ago and to those who have since implemented its far-reaching and important provisions.●

● Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act, the benchmark legislation which has so successfully created programs which assist older persons in continuing to be full participating members of our society.

The passage of the Older Americans Act [OAA] in 1965 indicated our country's awareness of the special needs of a growing aging population, and affirmed our commitment to providing programs targeted specifically to meet their special needs. Over the years, the act has remained in step with the growing needs of the elderly; Congress has voted, on seven separate occasions, to reauthorize it. Appropriations for the programs under the OAA have increased from \$6.5 million in fiscal 1966 to \$1 billion during fiscal 1984. Almost 10 million persons are now participants in OAA programs, either as providers or beneficiaries. Today, over 660 locally based Area Agencies on Aging [AAA] have been established to coordinate programs funded under the OAA to help older persons get the services they need to live independently in their community. Older persons can now receive a wide range of services, including information and referral, transportation, homemaker, home health, legal counseling, meals, residential repair, and others.

In my State of Arkansas, where we have the second highest per capita number of older persons in the country, and in my district, which is predominantly rural, the decentralized structure of the AAA's has served my constituents well. The emphasis on local control over the program's implementation creates a concerned and responsive network of AAA's dedicated to serving a growing aging population, whose needs they know and care about.

The nursing home ombudsman programs have been expanded to include consumer information, investigation, and recommendations to State legislatures. On any given occasion, I can call one of four AAA's serving my district and inquire about the quality of a nursing home, or the care of a patient there, and an ombudsman will go out that day and report back on the situation. Or, if I receive a letter about an elderly constituent who is unattended, or in need of assistance, I can call the local AAA director and they will have an AAA official go out to the home and tend to needs of that individual. I can't say enough good things about the AAA staffs in my district. So, Mr. Speaker, the AAA's have been an integral facet of the OAA, and have served as the eyes and ears from many Members, including myself.

There are some other aspects of this fine program which I would like to mention, mainly because they are unique in their usefulness and resourcefulness. First, the provision permitting the Department of Agriculture to contribute surplus commodities to the Title III Nutrition Program is both beneficial and cost effective; it allows these meal programs to serve more people by expanding their food budget. Second, the Title III Home Delivered Meals Program, which provides one meal a day to persons confined to their home, enables those persons to have a consistently nutritional diet and increased social interaction than might otherwise be available to them. In many cases, the home delivered meals allow persons to remain in the home and avoid costly institutionalization. The Congregate Meals Program is another program which has been highly successful. Meals are served in group settings, such as senior centers, schools, or churches, and qualifying older persons and their spouse may receive at least one meal per day, 5 days a week. This helps them to obtain needed nutrition while enjoying the company of other older persons. A wonderful part of this program is that those persons who can pay for either all or part of their meal are allowed to do so, and then this money is used to increase the number of meals served by the project.

I could go on and on describing the various programs which OAA funds, but the message, I trust, is clear. The OAA funds some of the most worthwhile, successful, and well-managed programs of any now supported by the Government. In this time of fiscal restraint, it is with pleasure that I look at programs such as these that are working to make life better for an invaluable sector of our society, without being a great burden to our budget. As a ranking member of the Select Committee on Aging, I am especially proud to see that legislation which helps older persons to live better quality lives is being commemorated today. I am honored to have had the opportunity to be involved, over the years, with many of the policies which have contributed to making life better for older persons, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that we continue to recognize, and address, the needs of older persons.●

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 132.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ARMY AND NAVY UNION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 897) to recognize the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 897

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

CHARTER

SECTION 1. The Army and Navy Union of the United States of America, organized and incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio, is hereby recognized as such and is granted a charter.

POWERS

SEC. 2. The Army and Navy Union of the United States of America (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation") shall have only those powers granted to it through its bylaws and articles of incorporation filed in the State or States in which it is incorporated and subject to the laws of such State or States.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation are those provided in its articles of incorporation and shall also be—

(a) to hold true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America and fidelity to its Constitution, laws, and institutions;

(b) to serve our Nation under God in peace as well as in war by fostering the ideals of faith and patriotism, loyalty, justice, and liberty; by inculcating in the hearts of young and old, through precept and practice, the spirit of true Americanism; by participating in civic activities for the good of our country and our community;

(c) to unite in fraternal fellowship those who have served honorably and those who are now serving honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States of America; to protect and advance their civic, social, and economic welfare; to aid them in sickness and distress; to assist in the burial and commemoration of their dead; and to provide help for their widows and orphans; and

(d) to perpetuate the memory of patriotic deeds performed by the defenders of our country.

SERVICE OF PROCESS

SEC. 4. With respect to service of process, the corporation shall comply with the laws of the States in which it is incorporated and

those States in which it carries on its activities in furtherance of its corporate purposes.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall be as provided in the bylaws of the corporation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 6. The board of directors of the corporation and the responsibilities thereof shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

OFFICERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 7. The officers of the corporation, and the election of such officers shall be as is provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States wherein it is incorporated.

RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 8. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director of the corporation or be distributed to any such person during the life of this charter. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to the officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of directors.

(b) The corporation shall not make any loan to any officer, director, or employee of the corporation.

(c) The corporation and any officer and director of the corporation, acting as such officer or director, shall not contribute to, support or otherwise participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

(d) The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare or pay any dividends.

(e) The corporation shall not claim congressional approval or Federal Government authority for any of its activities.

(f) The corporation shall retain and maintain its status as a corporation organized and incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio.

LIABILITY

SEC. 9. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 10. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of any proceeding of the corporation involving any of its members, the board of directors, or any committee having authority under the board of directors. The corporation shall keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of all members having the right to vote. All books and records of such corporation may be inspected by any member having the right to vote, or by any agent or attorney of such member, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time. Nothing in this section shall be construed to contravene any applicable State law.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 11. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law", approved August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1101) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(68) Army and Navy Union of the United States of America"

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 12. The corporation shall report annually to the Congress concerning the activities of the corporation during the preceding fiscal year. Such annual report shall be submitted at the same time as is the report of the audit required by section 11 of this Act. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 13. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved to the Congress.

DEFINITION OF "STATE"

SEC. 14. For purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS

SEC. 15. The corporation shall maintain its status as an organization exempt from taxation as provided in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. If the corporation fails to maintain such status, the charter granted hereby shall expire.

TERMINATION

SEC. 16. If the corporation shall fail to comply with any of the restrictions or provisions of this Act the charter granted hereby shall expire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KINDNESS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.].

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America, Inc. was founded in 1886 and incorporated under the nonprofit laws of the State of Ohio in 1888. This organization is a civic, fraternal and social organization which was established to promote patriotism. It is the oldest veterans' organization of its type in the United States.

Membership in the organization is not restricted to any specific form, date, branch, place, or nature of military service. It is comprised of approximately 8,400 veterans in 10 States.

Members of the Army and Navy Union perform volunteer service for veterans and their families, including charitable work at VA hospitals. They also serve as burial escorts and ceremonial honor guards at funerals and provide aid to families of deceased veterans in adjusting to their loss.

It is the recommendation of the Judiciary Committee that H.R. 897 be passed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from

Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING], the sponsor of this measure.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman, the soon-to-be distinguished Federal judge, the gentleman from Texas, for his support of this legislation and for bringing it to the floor in this timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 897, legislation I introduced to grant a Federal charter to the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America. I am grateful to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Law [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.] and to the chairman of the full Judiciary Committee [Mr. RODINO] for their willingness to bring my bill to the floor in such an expeditious manner.

The Army and Navy Union of the United States of America is a civic, fraternal and social organization united to promote patriotism in our society. The Army and Navy Union is the oldest veterans' organization of its type in the United States. Founded in 1886, and incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio since 1888, it is the only veterans' organization in which membership is not limited to any specific form, date, branch, place, or nature of military service performed.

The Army and Navy Union is dedicated to the preservation of a free and independent Union States, and to providing assistance to veterans and their dependents. Since its earliest days, the Army and Navy Union has worked for the enactment of equitable laws to provide pensions, medical care, and other benefits to veterans.

The Army and Navy Union currently has some 8,400 members with posts in Ohio, New York, Georgia, Indiana, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and the District of Columbia.

The Army and Navy Union is headed by a national commander and his staff. The National Corps is administered by officers elected at an annual convention. Any member in good standing is eligible to hold any office in the organization. Each member State has its own State Department, which administers the operation of the local posts, known as Garrisons. Each State Department holds an annual encampment. Garrisons meet formally at least once a month. Garrison members elect their own officers and their own delegates to the National Encampment and the Department Encampment.

Members of the Army and Navy Union work on a voluntary basis performing services of assistance to veterans and their families. Members serve as burial escorts and ceremonial honor guards at veterans' funerals. They perform charitable work at Veterans' Administration hospitals, and assist the

families of deceased veterans in adjusting to their loss.

The Army and Navy Union of the United States of America has a long and illustrious record of service to veterans and their families. Forty-one recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor, including Eddie Rickenbacker and Gen. Douglas MacArthur, have held membership in the organization. Other members include President William McKinley, Supreme Court Justice Harold Burton, and Senator Charles Dick of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House has the opportunity today to approve my bill, and thus to grant the Army and Navy Union the Federal charter which it has sought for so many years. The charter will provide this worthy organization with the national status it deserves.

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support and recommend approval by the House of this measure, which grants a charter to the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America.

The purpose of this legislation really is to recognize an existing State charter organization. The safeguards that are included in the granting of Federal charters over recent years are included in this legislation as well.

One of the things that might be brought to light in particular is that the legislation provides for certain contingencies which would cause a forfeiture of the charter if they were not complied with. There is annual reporting to the Congress on the functioning and financial functioning of the organization. The legislation requires the corporation to keep records, perform an annual audit as well. There are additional safeguards that are included in Federal legislation is included in this bill.

I think it is a worthy organization that should receive a Federal charter and I would urge support of the measure.

I have no requests for time, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in support of the bill and associate myself with the remarks of my two colleagues.

We are proud that the organization began in Ohio and I commend the chairman for having the legislation brought to the floor. I hope we can pass it unanimously.

□ 1330

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 897.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PEARL HARBOR SURVIVORS ASSOCIATION

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1042) to grant a Federal charter to the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1042

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CHARTER.

The Pearl Harbor Survivors Association, a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Missouri, is recognized as such and is granted a Federal charter.

SEC. 2. POWERS.

The Pearl Harbor Survivors Association (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "corporation") shall have those powers granted to it through its bylaws and articles of incorporation filed in the State in which it is incorporated and subject to the laws of such State, and such powers shall include the following:

- (1) To sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction.
- (2) To adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal.
- (3) To take gifts, legacies, and devices which will further the corporate purposes.
- (4) To adopt, alter, and amend a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs.
- (5) To change and collect membership dues and subscription fees and to receive contributions or grants of money or property to be used to carry out its purposes.
- (6) To establish, regulate, and maintain offices for the conduct of the affairs of the corporation.
- (7) To promote the formation of auxiliaries, the membership requirements of which

shall be determined according to the constitution and the bylaws of the corporation.

(8) To publish a magazine or other publications.

(9) To adopt emblems and badges.

(10) To do any and all lawful acts and things necessary or desirable to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 3. OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION.

The objects and purposes of the corporation are those provided in its articles of incorporation and shall include the following:

(1) To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States.

(2) To collate, preserve, and encourage the study of historical episodes, chronicles, mementos, and events pertaining to "The Day of Infamy, 7 December 1941", and in particular those memories and records of patriotic service performed by the heroic Pearl Harbor survivors and nonsurvivors.

(3) To shield from neglect the graves, past and future, of those who served at Pearl Harbor on such day.

(4) To stimulate communities and political subdivisions into taking more interest in the affairs and future of the United States in order to keep our Nation alert.

(5) To fight unceasingly for our national security in order to protect the United States from enemies within and without our borders.

(6) To preserve the American way of life and to foster the spirit and practice of Americanism.

(7) To instill love of country and flag and to promote soundness of mind and body in the youth of our Nation.

SEC. 4. SERVICE OF PROCESS.

With respect to service of process, the corporation shall comply with the laws of the State in which it is incorporated and those States in which it carries on its activities in furtherance of its corporate purposes.

SEC. 5. ELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP.

Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members of the corporation shall be as provided in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation, except that terms of membership and requirements for holding office within the corporation shall not be discriminatory on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

SEC. 6. BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

The composition of the board of directors of the corporation and the responsibilities of such board shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State in which it is incorporated.

SEC. 7. OFFICERS OF CORPORATION.

The positions of officers of the corporation and the election of members to such positions shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State in which it is incorporated.

SEC. 8. RESTRICTIONS ON CORPORATE POWER.

(a) DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME OR ASSETS TO MEMBERS OR OFFICERS OF THE CORPORATION.—No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director of the corporation or be distributed to any such person during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of compensation to the officers of the corporation for services rendered to the corporation or to prevent their reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of directors.

(b) LOANS OR ADVANCES.—The corporation shall have no power to make loans or advances to any member, officer, director, or employee of the corporation.

(c) ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS.—The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

(d) NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF THE CORPORATION.—The corporation and its officers, employees, and agents acting as such shall have no power to contribute to, support, or otherwise participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

(e) APPROVAL OF THE CONGRESS OR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—The corporation shall have no power to claim congressional approval or Federal Government authority for any of its activities.

SEC. 9. LIABILITY.

The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when they have acted within the scope of their authority.

SEC. 10. BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION.

The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of accounts and shall keep minutes of the any proceeding involving any of its members, the board of directors, or any committee having authority under the board of directors. The corporation shall keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of all members having the right to vote in any proceeding of the corporation. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member, or any agent or attorney of such member, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

SEC. 11. AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS.

The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law", approved August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 636; 36 U.S.C. 1101), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(69) Pearl Harbor Survivors Association."

SEC. 12. ANNUAL REPORT.

The corporation shall report annually to the Congress concerning the activities of the corporation during the preceding fiscal year. Such annual report shall be submitted at the same time as the report of the audit of the corporation required pursuant to section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law", approved August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 636; 36 U.S.C. 1102). The report shall not be printed as a public document.

SEC. 13. RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER.

The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved to the Congress.

SEC. 14. DEFINITION OF "STATE".

For purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

SEC. 15. TAX-EXEMPT STATUS.

The corporation shall maintain its status as an organization exempt from taxation as provided in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

SEC. 16. EXCLUSIVE USE OF CORPORATE NAME.

The corporation and its regional districts and local branches shall have the sole and exclusive right to use in carrying out its purposes the name "Pearl Harbor Survivors

Association", and such seals, emblems, and badges as the corporation may adopt.

SEC. 17. TERMINATION.

If the corporation shall fail to comply with any of the restrictions or provisions of this Act, the charter granted by this Act shall expire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KINDNESS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.].

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association is a nonprofit corporation which was organized in 1958. In 1964, the association was incorporated under the laws of Missouri.

As the name of the organization suggests, this organization was formed by a group of survivors of the attack on Pearl Harbor by the Japanese on December 7, 1941. Membership is open to anyone who, on that infamous date, was a member of the Armed Forces of the United States and who was stationed on Pearl Harbor, the Island of Oahu, or offshore within 3 miles. The association currently has about 9,700 members.

The Pearl Harbor Survivors Association is dedicated to the purpose of promoting and promulgating the obligations of citizenship and patriotism. They are active in preserving gravesites of those who died in the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. They also erect monuments and preserve historical mementos of that attack.

It is the recommendation of the Judiciary Committee that H.R. 1042 be passed by the House.

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I support and recommend adoption of this Federal charter as well.

One comment does appear to be in order. In the granting of Federal charters we have in recent years granted some charters to organizations which are bound to have a limited existence. This is one of those organizations. Because of its membership being basically those who were survivors of a particular event in history there is no opportunity for that membership to expand and continue on a perpetual basis.

Whether such charters should be granted is open to some question as a matter of policy for this House and the other body to decide. This is a worthy organization. Its purposes are good and sound. Its services to veterans are very appropriate, and I support the granting of the charter.

I think, however, we ought to be looking a lot more closely at whether charters should be granted to organizations that are bound to reduce in size and at some point in time be inactive or become inactive, for all practical purposes at any rate.

The question then is what do we do to clean up the record. Does the Congress then pass legislation to disestablish the Federal charter with the emotional approach that might be involved in such cases, or do we wait until the organization no longer qualifies under State law as a valid corporation, and then the Federal charter automatically ceases to exist?

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, we have granted charters of this nature to the submarine veterans of World War II, for example, in the last Congress. I think this group is certainly worthy of that same recognition and I would only raise the policy question for consideration further down the line with any subsequent opportunities that we have to consider it with organizations of a similar sort.

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 1042, I rise in strong support of granting a Federal charter to the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association to honor its 9,700 current members who survived that unprovoked and devastating attack by the Japanese nearly 44 years ago.

Membership in this distinguished veterans organization is open to anyone who was a member of the U.S. Armed Forces stationed in Pearl Harbor, on the Island of Oahu or offshore on that fateful day that launched our Nation into World War II, December 7, 1941.

Members of the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association continue to serve our Nation honorably today. They work to preserve relics of the attack as well as the gravesites of those who were not so fortunate and gave their lives on that day in defense of our Nation.

In passing this legislation we not only honor the survivors, but also their fallen comrades.

Let us pledge our commitment to ensuring the strength of the United States against foreign aggression to guarantee that such a tragic incident will never occur again.

I urge adoption of the bill.●

● Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as the prime sponsor of this legislation, I rise in support of H.R. 1042, which would grant a national charter to the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has thoroughly explained the bill's purpose and how it accomplishes this purpose. I am grateful to him and to the chairman of the full committee, Mr. RODINO, for their courtesy and for the expeditious treatment which they have given to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to pay tribute to those Americans who survived the most disastrous surprise attack ever undertaken against America. But, just as importantly, this legislation gives us the opportunity to pay homage to those who did not survive this event. Those who were killed—and those who were permanently disabled—were the true heroes of this episode and are the ones we honor by passing this bill today.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation. It carries with it no cost to the Treasury, but a tremendous amount of significance to those who were there, those who lost loved ones there and those who remember the horror of that Sunday morning 44 years ago.●

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1042, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DAUGHTERS OF UNION VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR 1861-65

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1806) to recognize the organization known as the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War 1861-1865.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1806

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

CHARTER

SECTION 1. The Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War 1861-1865, a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Ohio, is recognized as such and is granted a Federal charter.

POWERS

SEC. 2. The Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War 1861-1865 (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "corporation") shall have only those powers granted to it through its bylaws and articles of incorporation filed in the State or States in which it

is incorporated and subject to the laws of such State or States.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation are those provided in its articles of incorporation and, for the purpose of perpetuating the memories of the fathers of the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War 1861-1865, their loyalty to the Union, and their unselfish sacrifices for the preservation of the same, shall include the following:

(1) Encouraging the preservation of historic sites and the construction and preservation of monuments commemorating any aspect of the Civil War.

(2) Building and maintaining a Museum of Civil War History, admission to which shall be free and open to the public, in the city of Springfield, Illinois, as a repository of Civil War documents, artifacts, and cultural relics.

(3) Maintaining a library in connection with the Civil War museum, admission to which shall be open to the public, containing the official volumes of the War of the Rebellion Records, Civil War genealogical files, Adjutant General reports to the various States, military and biographical records and accounts of the individual service of Union soldiers, sailors, and marines, diaries, letters, relics, and other records.

(4) Promulgating and teaching American history, particularly the history of the Civil War period, through the establishment of scholarship programs at the National and State levels, the presentation of American flags to youth groups and newly naturalized citizens, and the sponsorship of contests of educational merit.

(5) Caring for veterans of all wars through volunteer programs in Veterans' Administration medical centers and in homes and other institutions maintained by the States for the welfare of American veterans.

(6) Participating, in a spirit of cooperation and reciprocity, in programs with other societies devoted to American history, veterans' affairs, or community interests.

The corporation shall function as a veterans' and patriotic organization as authorized by the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

SERVICE OF PROCESS

SEC. 4. With respect to service of process, the corporation shall comply with the laws of the States in which it is incorporated and those States in which it carries on its activities in furtherance of its corporate purposes.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members of the corporation shall be as provided in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 6. The composition of the board of directors of the corporation and the responsibilities of such board shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

OFFICERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 7. The positions of officers of the corporation and the election of members to such positions shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

RESTRICTIONS

Sec. 8. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation may inure to the benefit of any member, officer, or director of the corporation or be distributed to any such individual during the life of this charter. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to the officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of directors.

(b) The corporation may not make any loan to any officer, director, or employee of the corporation.

(c)(1) The corporation may not contribute to, support, or otherwise participate in any political activity or attempt in any manner to influence legislation.

(2) No officer or director of the corporation, acting as such officer or director, may commit any act prohibited under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(d) The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare or pay any dividends.

(e) The corporation shall not claim congressional approval or the authorization of the Federal Government for any of its activities.

LIABILITY

Sec. 9. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents whenever such officers and agents have acted within the scope of their authority.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

Sec. 10. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and minutes of any proceeding of the corporation involving any of its members, the board of directors, or any committee having authority under the board of directors. The corporation shall keep, at its principal office, a record of the names and addresses of all members having the right to vote in any proceeding of the corporation. All books and records of such corporation may be inspected by any member having the right to vote in any corporation proceeding, or by any agent or attorney of such member, for any proper purpose at any reasonable time. Nothing in this section shall be construed to contravene any applicable State law.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

Sec. 11. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law", approved August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1101), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(70) Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War 1861-1865."

ANNUAL REPORT

Sec. 12. The corporation shall report annually to the Congress concerning the activities of the corporation during the preceding fiscal year. Such annual report shall be submitted at the same time as the report of the audit required by section 11 of this Act. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

Sec. 13. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved to the Congress.

DEFINITION OF "STATE"

Sec. 14. For purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS

Sec. 15. The corporation shall maintain its status as an organization exempt from taxation as provided in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. If the corporation fails to maintain such status, the charter granted by this Act shall expire.

TERMINATION

Sec. 16. If the corporation shall fail to comply with any of the restrictions or provisions of this Act, the charter granted by this Act shall expire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KINDNESS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.].

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Daughters of the Union Veterans of the Civil War 1861-1865 is a nonprofit organization which was organized in Massillon, OH, on May 30, 1885. It was incorporated as the National Alliance for Daughters of Veterans on December 12, 1885. In 1944, the corporation changed its name to the Daughters of the Union Veterans of the Civil War 1861-65. This organization is among the oldest veteran and patriotic societies in the country.

Membership in this organization is open to women descendants of Union soldiers, sailors, and marines who were honorably discharged, killed, or missing in action. Members must be at least 8 years of age. This organization has a membership of over 20,000.

The objects of the organization are to promote this Nation's history and to perpetuate the memories of the men who sacrificed their lives and well-being to preserve the Union. This organization has built and maintains a museum and library in Springfield, IL, which is dedicated to Civil War memorabilia. The organization has established scholarships at the State and national level to encourage educational achievement in U.S. history. It also provides scholarships, awards, and gifts for young men and women who serve in the Nation's four military academies. This organization has been active in efforts to construct and preserve monuments which commemorate the Civil War. Members also serve as volunteers to help veterans in medical centers, homes, and other institutions.

It is the recommendation of the Judiciary Committee that H.R. 1806 be passed by the House.

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for his support of this measure which, in fact, does afford the opportunity for members of the organization to provide comfort and services to veterans, regardless of their geographic origin.

As the gentleman from Texas has pointed out, the organization now known as the Daughters of the Union Veterans of the Civil War 1861-1865, Inc., is an organization that began its life back in 1885.

We have had ample opportunity to see the kind of services they provide through their 34 departments organized State by State. Each department consists of three or more tents or local organizations at the community level. And through this network or organizational elements the members of the Daughters of the Union Veterans of the Civil War reach out to veterans all over this country.

□ 1340

Perhaps the most important service rendered by the organization is its support for the U.S. veterans administrative volunteer service.

This charter might be differentiated from the previous one, and I think it may be in order to comment to that effect since we are talking about an organization based on history that is more remote in point of time.

However, the potential for the membership of this organization to grow rather than to shrink is what differentiates the two.

The prior organization, Survivors of Pearl Harbor, of course, are a finite group. The Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, of course, increase in number as the years go by, barring unforeseen circumstances.

I would strongly urge the support and passage of this measure granting a charter which, again, contains all of the safeguards that are included in Federal charter provisions in recent years under the rules that are followed by the Subcommittee on Administrative Law of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I think we can join in strongly supporting this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1806, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SELECTION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS TO DECIDE MULTIPLE APPEALS

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 439) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the selection of the court of appeals to decide multiple appeals filed with respect to the same agency order.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 439

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2112(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the last three sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "If proceedings are instituted in two or more courts of appeals with respect to the same order, the following shall apply:

"(1) If within ten days after issuance of the order the agency, board, commission, or officer concerned receives, from the persons instituting the proceedings, the petition for review with respect to proceedings in at least two courts of appeals, the agency, board, commission, or officer shall proceed in accordance with paragraph (3) of this subsection. If within ten days after the issuance of the order the agency, board, commission, or officer concerned receives, from the persons instituting the proceedings, the petition for review with respect to proceedings in only one court of appeals, the agency, board, commission, or officer shall file the record in that court notwithstanding the institution in any other court of appeals of proceedings for review of that order. In all other cases in which proceedings have been instituted in two or more courts of appeals with respect to the same order, the agency, board, commission, or officer concerned shall file the record in the court in which proceedings with respect to the order were first instituted.

"(2) For purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection, a copy of the petition or other pleading which institutes proceedings in a court of appeals and which is stamped by the court with the date of filing shall constitute the petition for review. Each agency, board, commission, or officer, as the case may be, shall designate by rule the office and the officer who must receive petitions for review under paragraph (1).

"(3) If an agency, board, commission, or officer receives two or more petitions for review of an order in accordance with the first sentence of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the agency, board, commission, or officer shall, promptly after the expiration of the ten-day period specified in that sentence, so notify the judicial panel on multidistrict litigation authorized by section 1407

of this title, in such form as that panel shall prescribe. The judicial panel on multidistrict litigation shall, by means of random selection, designate one court of appeals, from among the courts of appeals in which petitions for review have been filed and received within the ten-day period specified in the first sentence of paragraph (1), in which the record is to be filed, and shall issue an order consolidating the petitions for review in that court of appeals. The judicial panel on multidistrict litigation shall, after providing notice to the public and an opportunity for the submission of comments, prescribe rules with respect to the consolidation of proceedings under this paragraph. The agency, board, commission, or officer concerned shall file the record in the court of appeals designated pursuant to this paragraph.

"(4) Any court of appeals in which proceedings with respect to an order of an agency, board, commission, or officer have been instituted may, to the extent authorized by law, stay the effective date of the order. Any such stay may thereafter be modified, revoked, or extended by a court of appeals designated pursuant to paragraph (3) with respect to that order or by any other court of appeals to which the proceedings are transferred.

"(5) All courts in which proceedings are instituted with respect to the same order, other than the court in which the record is filed pursuant to this subsection, shall transfer those proceedings to the court in which the record is so filed. For the convenience of the parties in the interest of justice, the court in which the record is filed may thereafter transfer all the proceedings with respect to that order to any other court of appeals."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect one hundred and eighty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that the judicial panel on multidistrict litigation may issue rules pursuant to subsection (a)(3) of section 2112 of title 28, United States Code, as added by the first section of this Act, on or after such date of enactment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KINDNESS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.].

Mr. SAM B. HALL JR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 439 is to simplify the selection of the proper court to handle the judicial appeal of an agency order in those cases where petitions for review are filed in more than one court of appeals.

When a Federal agency issues an order, two or more parties often file judicial challenges to the validity of that order. Because many statutes do not specify a particular circuit as the court to handle these challenges, venue for the judicial challenge is proper in any of the Federal circuits in which challenges are filed. If appeals are filed in more than one circuit, a

single circuit must be selected to handle the appeal.

Until 1958, each agency had the option of selecting which circuit would have venue when appeals of the agency's order were filed in more than one circuit. Since this appeared to result in an unfair advantage for the agency, title 28 was amended in 1958 to provide that the circuit of venue would be the circuit where the appeal of an agency order was filed first. This first-to-file rule was intended to assure that the agency had no special advantage over the challenger.

However, the 1958 amendment had an unintended effect. Many lawyers believed that a certain circuit would be more sympathetic to their client's arguments than other circuits. Thus, races to the courthouse began to occur, with each lawyer trying to file first in the circuit he or she felt would be sympathetic.

These races to the courthouse have become highly sophisticated. Messengers are assigned to hover around agency offices waiting for the exact moment an order is issued. Other messengers, armed with forms for filing the appeal, are stationed at the offices of the clerks of various circuits. The two are often connected with by open long-distance telephone lines or walkie-talkies so that the appeal will be filed the instant the agency order is issued. The result is that filings are frequently made in various circuits within minutes, or even seconds, of each other.

Races to the courthouse have resulted in unfortunate consequences for the system of justice. Since they are based on the theory that one court will interpret the law differently from another court, these races detract from the public's perception of the Federal courts as impartial, consistent arbiters of justice. In addition, these races produce no economic benefit, yet often cost private participants tens of thousands of dollars. Finally, once the race is complete, the parties—as well as the Federal courts and agencies—must expend more resources on wasteful litigation to determine who won the race and thus which is the appropriate circuit for review.

H.R. 439 remedies this situation by removing the incentive to race to the courthouse. It does this by modifying the first-to-file rule so that when more than one appeal of an agency order is filed, all petitions will stand on the same footing in the determination of which circuit will handle the appeal, with one of the circuits selected at random to do so.

The Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation will handle the random selection from among those circuits in which petitions have been filed. A party wishing to qualify for the random selection procedure will have

to meet two conditions. First, the party will have to file an appeal of the agency order within 10 days after issuance of the order. Second, the party will also have to file a copy of the petition for review with the agency within the same 10-day period.

The random selection will include one entry for each circuit in which proceedings are pending, rather than one entry for each petitioner. After the selection, the judicial panel will issue an order consolidating all petitions for review in the selected circuit. The judicial panel is required to establish rules to govern these selection procedures after providing the public with notice and an opportunity to comment on such rules.

The circuit in which the proceedings are consolidated will take jurisdiction over all review proceedings dealing with the same order. This court will retain its existing power to transfer proceedings for the convenience of the parties in the interest of justice. H.R. 439 does not change current standards for transfer. Moreover, does not cover cases where venue is specified by statute to lie in one particular circuit or cases which are filed in the district courts.

During the period before the random selection, any court of appeals in which a proceeding has been filed may stay the effective date of the agency order. Any such stays may thereafter be modified, revoked, or extended by the selected court in which the proceedings are consolidated. H.R. 439 does not alter the current standards by which courts determine whether to grant a stay.

No random selection will be required if a second proceeding is commenced more than 10 days after issuance of the agency order or if all proceedings are filed later than ten days after the issuance of the order. In these cases, the first-to-file rule will continue in effect since no real race to the courthouse is involved.

In the 98th Congress, the House passed a measure identical to H.R. 439 (H.R. 5365). Also, in the 96th and 97th Congresses, the Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported a provision similar to that contained in H.R. 439 as part of the omnibus regulatory reform bill. A similar measure was also adopted by the Senate in the 97th Congress as part of the Senate regulatory reform bill. The basic approach of the bill has had strong bipartisan support.

H.R. 439 contains a significant improvement in the way venue is determined in cases of multiple filings. It is supported by the Department of Justice, the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Administrative Conference of the United States, and the American Bar Association.

The Judiciary Committee recommends its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of H.R. 439.

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, from the annals of the history of that period of our Nation's past, when the west was being settled, we can conjure up notions of the cavalry coming thundering across the hills to the rescue of the settler's family as the cabin burns to the ground.

But today we have the modern electronic equivalent to that sort of scene in the races to the courthouses described so aptly and ably by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.].

We have people, lawyers instead of cavalymen, talking to each other by walkie-talkie and open long-distance telephone lines trying to save the Republic from this order issued by an agency seconds before.

Perhaps it was more appropriate to have the cavalry save the settlers in the old days of the West. It is certainly not appropriate to have the kind of race to the courthouse that we see occurring every now and then as agency orders are issued and the lawyers scramble to see who can be first in the court.

□ 1350

Surely it is not always to save the Republic. Sometimes it is to save or attempt to save those who are going to be affected by the agency order, of course, and that is not always the public at large.

The amount of resources that are devoted to such races to the courthouse seem outlandish at times. In the overall context of things, it may not be the most important sort of thing that goes on in our society from day to day, but it is one more thing that tends to detract from the dignity and respect accorded to our judicial system, and indeed the administrative workings of our Government as well.

H.R. 439 is designed to eliminate the unseemliness of the race to the courthouse. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.] and I have worked together on this legislation and legislation like it in the last Congress or two.

I think it is simple and relatively reasonable way to resolve a problem that exists that detracts from the dignity of the administrative process and the court system, and I would hope that the House would indeed support passage of H.R. 439.

I would, however, Mr. Speaker, be greatly remiss if I closed my remarks without commenting upon the somewhat subdued nature of my conduct today, which arises at least in part perhaps from the realization that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B.

HALL, JR.], my esteemed friend, my highly respected friend, will be leaving soon this House to assume a position on the Federal bench in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas.

I am somewhat reminded of the remark that was attributed, I believe, to Sam Houston upon the removal of Davey Crockett from Tennessee to Texas when he said that by making that move, Crockett greatly uplifted the intellectual climate of both States.

Perhaps that—we will let you think about that for a moment, Mr. Speaker—the gentleman from Texas has graced us with his presence, he has worked hard at his job, he has represented well the people of his part of east Texas, he has before him a career on the bench that I think will prove once again the great ability of this gentleman to serve the public and serve the public well.

We shall miss him very much in the Committee on the Judiciary, and in the House of Representatives, and certainly on the Administrative Law Subcommittee which he chaired in these last two Congresses.

I wish our respected colleague the very, very best as he assumes a new position in public service, and hope that the opportunity will be there to visit, whether it be in Washington, in Texas, or anyplace else on the face of the globe, from time to time. The gentleman will indeed be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I would not be at all proper if I did not thank TOM KINDNESS for the tremendous work that we have done on this committee. It has been a bipartisan effort from the inception until today.

In my opinion, TOM KINDNESS is—and I was going to say this anyway—is one of the outstanding Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. I know when I came here 9 years ago I met him at that time, when I became a member of the Judiciary Committee; we have had many hours of work together, all very good and most favorable in every sense of the word, and he is a true gentleman in every respect. He is an outstanding member, and I cannot say enough about him, and I have said this before publicly and privately.

The Congress of the United States needs more people like TOM KINDNESS, and I hope that our paths do cross, TOM, in the future; but I hope that when we do visit it is of a personal nature and not an official nature, insofar as you are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I would also be remiss if I did not pay the highest tribute to the majority and minority staff on this subcommittee: William P. Shattuck, who has been a tremendous in-

spiration to me in the guidance that he has given over the last several years. Janet Potts, there is no way I can thank her for the many, many fine things she has done for me on this committee. Jennifer Ihlo, from Center, TX, who is a new member of the counsel staff, but who is doing an outstanding job in every respect.

They are truly dedicated people in every sense of the word. They are non-partisan, and I must include in this Kevin Richardson, of the minority counsel, who has worked very closely with me as well as his mentor there, Tom KINDNESS, and all of us together have been a great team, I think. I like to believe that, anyway, and I hope that whoever in the future aspires to this chairmanship will continue to work for these people like we have in the past two Congresses, and I know that by doing that that this subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue to be one of the bright spots of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 439.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 439, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE NEED FOR H.R. 2285: FREEDOM-OF-CHOICE HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATIONS AT RISK—ALTERNATIVE FOR MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit, for the attention of my colleagues, the following concept paper prepared by Mr. Jeffrey A. Prussin, senior vice president of Government programs and plan development of the International Medical Centers, Inc., in Miami, FL, regarding H.R. 2285, legislation I introduced several days ago providing for "freedom-of-choice health maintenance organization demonstrations."

Mr. Prussin's paper provides a clear explanation of H.R. 2285 which I hope

will be useful to my colleagues as they give consideration to this most innovative and necessary legislation. I include Mr. Prussin's paper entitled "Freedom-of-Choice HMO's at Risk: A New Alternative for Medicare" in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

FREEDOM-OF CHOICE HMO'S AT RISK: A NEW ALTERNATIVE FOR MEDICARE

INTRODUCTION

Prepaid Medicare demonstrations

The Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) conducted a series of prepaid Medicare demonstration programs throughout the country under which health maintenance organizations (HMO) and similar organizations were paid by HCFA at the rate of 95 percent of the adjusted average per capita cost (AAPCC), or less, for providing Medicare services to enrolled Medicare beneficiaries. This was a prospective payment system that was not adjusted retroactively; all profits or surpluses were retained by the HMO, and all losses were the responsibility of the HMO.

In order to induce Medicare beneficiaries to enroll in their demonstration programs, some of the participating HMOs developed extremely comprehensive benefits packages for Medicare enrollees. In many cases, Medicare enrollees paid nothing to join the HMO and received extra benefits such as elimination of the Medicare deductibles and copayments, free prescription drugs, free eyeglasses and hearing aids, unlimited acute care hospitalization, routine eye and hearing examinations, routine foot care, routine physical examinations, and a broad range of dental services.

Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act

HCFA now has implemented the provisions of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 [TEFRA] which established as a regular part of the Medicare program a risk-based contracting mechanism for HMOs and competitive medical plans [CMP] that is similar to the HMO demonstration programs. The primary difference between the demonstrations and TEFRA is addition of the adjusted community rate [ACR] under TEFRA. The ACR is the organization's community rate, adjusted for the regular Medicare program benefits and the anticipated utilization differences between the organization's Medicare and non-Medicare members. TEFRA permits payment to HMOs and CMPs based upon the organization's ACR, plus the value of enhancements to the regular Medicare program benefits offered by the organization, up to 95 percent of the AAPCC. The ACR was included under TEFRA as a mechanism for limiting the organization's profit or surplus levels generated by Medicare enrollees, proportionally, to the profit or surplus levels experienced by that organization for non-Medicare enrollees.

OPERATIONAL ISSUES

The HMO demonstration programs raised several issues that also may prove to be relevant to TEFRA as implementation of TEFRA progresses, including the following:

Cost Increases—Although HCFA pays HMOs at the rate of 95 percent of the AAPCC or less, the Medicare program actually may experience cost increases for HMO risk-basis enrollees due to favorable selection bias.

Selection Bias—Favorable selection bias occurs when individuals with lower health costs enroll in an HMO. In this event, the Medicare program could lose money, even

while contracting with and paying an HMO at a discount rate, such as 95 percent of the AAPCC or less. That is, if the Medicare program pays an HMO at 95 percent of the AAPCC, and if the HMO enrolls individuals who are, on the average, in better health or lower utilizers (e.g., whose costs would be less than 95 percent of the AAPCC in the fee-for-service system), the Medicare program will lose money by paying 95 percent of the AAPCC. Of course, selection bias also may be adverse to an HMO, in which case individuals with higher health costs enroll in the HMO. HCFA's evaluation of the traditional HMO Medicare demonstrations will address the selection bias issue, and a definitive answer on this subject, beyond the findings from the early demonstrations,¹ is anticipated.

Oversight and Regulation—Since Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in risk-basis HMOs are locked into the HMO, at least for 45-60 days, HCFA, maintains a responsibility to monitor the quality, accessibility, availability, acceptability, etc., of HMOs' services. Moreover, due to HMO "lock in" provisions, HCFA and other State and Federal regulatory agencies, in many instances, are placed in a position of serving as arbitrators between an HMO and its Medicare enrollees with respect to enrollee complaints. Indeed, complaints to HCFA and other regulatory agencies by Medicare enrollees who do not understand HMO "lock in" provisions at the time of enrollment are a constant source of problems for HCFA and other regulatory agencies, HMOs, non-HMO providers, and Medicare beneficiaries.

Enrollment—Enrollment of Medicare beneficiaries by HMOs has been hindered by the facts that:

A beneficiary must take a positive action (i.e., sign enrollment form) to enroll in an HMO.

By enrolling in an HMO, the beneficiary loses freedom-of-choice of providers due to HMO "lock in" provisions.

Moreover, since the Medicare market is more like an individual than a group market, it is both expensive and difficult for HMOs to reach potential Medicare enrollees.

¹ For example, Paul W. Eggers and Ronald Prihoda studied 18,085 Medicare beneficiaries who enrolled in three demonstration HMO plans as of April 1981. The plans were the Fallon Community Health Plan (Worcester County, Massachusetts), the Greater Marshfield Community Health Plan (Marshfield, Wisconsin) and the Kaiser-Permanente Medical Care Program, Portland, Oregon. The study found that enrollees in the Fallon and Kaiser plans had 20 percent lower Medicare reimbursements than their respective comparison groups in the four years prior to enrollment. There was not a statistically significant difference in pre-enrollment total Medicare reimbursements between the enrollee and comparison groups for the Marshfield plan. See: Paul W. Eggers and Ronald Prihoda, "Pre-Enrollment Reimbursement Patterns of Medicare Beneficiaries Enrolled in 'At-Risk' HMOs," Health Care Financing Review, September 1982, volume 4, NO. 1, pp. 55-73. Eggers also studied Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in the Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound (Seattle, Washington) under a risk contract. The study found that beneficiaries who enrolled during an open enrollment period had a reimbursement rate for inpatient services that was 47 percent below the comparison group. Enrolled beneficiaries also appeared to have a lower utilization rate for Part B services. See: Paul Eggers, "Risk Differential Between Medicare Beneficiaries Enrolled and Not Enrolled in an HMO," Health Care Financing Review, Winter 1980, volume 1, No. 3, pp. 91-99.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

The freedom-of-choice HMO at risk demonstration program is designed to:

Save money for the Medicare program and control costs by placing large numbers of Medicare beneficiaries in specified geographic areas in an at risk, capitation payment system. In addition, to the extent that freedom-of-choice demonstration HMOs provide benefits such as prescription drugs that would otherwise be covered by Medicaid, savings also will be realized by the Medicaid program for demonstration enrollees with both Medicare and Medicaid coverage. Eliminate selection bias in HMO enrollment of Medicare beneficiaries.

Reduce substantially the need for oversight and regulation by HCFA and other State and Federal regulatory agencies, and eliminate the need for enrollment mix requirements such as the 50/50 rule under TEFRA. This rule requires the HMO to enroll one non-Medicare or Medicaid member for every Medicare or Medicaid member.

Simplify the enrollment process for Medicare beneficiaries and HMOs.

Eliminate the restrictive HMO "lock in" provisions that have hindered the attractiveness of HMOs to potential enrollees and, hence, the growth of HMOs.

RETENTION OF ALL OPTIONS BY MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES

The key feature of the freedom-of-choice HMO at risk concept, in addition to elimination of selection bias, is preservation of all current options, as well as addition of new options, for enrolled Medicare beneficiaries. Specifically, beneficiaries enrolled in the freedom-of-choice HMO demonstrations will retain the right to receive their health services through any qualified Medicare provider, without referral or authorization by the HMO, exactly as they do at the present time. However:

HMOs, which will be paid by HCFA at the rate of 95 percent of the AAPCC, will be at risk financially to pay the same amount as Medicare would pay for Medicare covered services not provided directly through the HMO.

Beneficiaries using Medicare covered services not provided directly through the HMO will continue to be responsible for Medicare deductible and coinsurance amounts and will continue to be subject to all Medicare limits on services.

After HCFA assigns financial risk for Medicare beneficiaries to a freedom-of-choice HMO demonstration, enrolled beneficiaries will have, continuously, the option of receiving any or all of their health services directly through the HMO. Indeed, the HMO will attempt to induce beneficiaries to use services provided directly through the HMO by reducing or eliminating the Medicare deductible and coinsurance amounts and by providing more comprehensive benefits, including benefits for services that are not covered by the regular Medicare program, for enrollees receiving their services directly through the HMO. Moreover, in order to induce enrollees to use services provided directly through the HMO exclusively, to the exclusion of non-HMO services provided without referral or authorization by the HMO, the HMO could make certain extra benefits, such as prescription drugs and eyeglasses, available to Medicare beneficiaries who receive all of their health services directly through the HMO for a specified period of time.

Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in freedom-of-choice HMO demonstrations will be

permitted to switch back and forth, at any time, between using services provided directly through the HMO and using non-HMO services without referral or authorization by the HMO. Again, however, the HMO will receive payment at the rate of 95 percent of the AAPCC from HCFA and will maintain full financial responsibility for paying claims for Medicare covered services that are not provided directly through the HMO. Moreover, individuals using services not provided directly through the HMO will continue to be responsible for the Medicare deductible and coinsurance amounts, will continue to be subject to all Medicare limits on services, including the limits on the number of acute care hospital and skilled nursing facility days, and will not receive any of the added benefits offered by the HMO to beneficiaries receiving their services directly through the HMO.

CLAIMS PAYMENT/ADMINISTRATION

Each freedom-of-choice HMO demonstration will have the option of fulfilling the Medicare intermediary and carrier functions itself with respect to its enrollees or of using the existing intermediaries and carriers to make payments for services rendered by non-HMO providers without referral or authorization by the HMO. In the event that the HMO uses extant intermediaries and carriers, the HMO will maintain final authority for claims review, including determination of the medical necessity of services, whether services are covered under Medicare, and whether claims should be paid. (Of course, the regular Medicare appeals process for denied claims still will be available to adversely affected beneficiaries and providers.)

Once the HMO determines that a claim should be paid, the intermediary or carrier, if the HMO uses extant intermediaries and carriers, will determine the Medicare allowable amount and make the appropriate payment. Again, however, the funds needed to pay claims for Medicare covered services not provided directly through the HMO will be the responsibility of the HMO.

RANDOM ASSIGNMENT BY HCFA

Large numbers of, if not all, Medicare beneficiaries residing in areas in which there are freedom-of-choice HMO demonstrations will be assigned randomly to the HMOs participating in the demonstrations, up to the service delivery capacities of the participating HMOs. (Beneficiaries already enrolled in HMOs in a demonstration area, if any, will remain in the HMOs in which they are enrolled.) Assignment of beneficiaries will eliminate the need for costly HMO marketing efforts designed to generate enrollment in the HMO by Medicare beneficiaries.

Since beneficiaries, in essence, will be able to ignore the HMO and continue to receive their Medicare covered services in the same manner and from the same providers as at the present time, without any added restrictions, the random assignment of financial risk for beneficiaries to participating HMOs should pose no problems. In other words, the beneficiaries assigned to participating HMOs will not lose their freedom-of-choice in providers. Rather, these beneficiaries will have the added option of using services provided directly through the HMO, in which case the beneficiaries will receive added benefits, such as elimination of the Medicare deductible and coinsurance amounts and benefits for services for covered under the regular Medicare program (e.g., prescription drugs and eyeglasses).

INTER-HMO TRANSFERS

In areas in which more than one HMO participates in a freedom-of-choice demonstration, some enrollees may have preferences regarding the specific HMOs in which they wish to be enrolled based upon factors such as the HMOs' benefits packages, reputations, and provider locations. Therefore, it will be necessary to permit Medicare beneficiaries assigned to a particular HMO to request reassignment to another HMO. However, the incidence of requests for reassignment should be very low and, therefore, should not create administrative problems or affect selection bias one way or the other.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The freedom-of-choice HMO at risk demonstration program will be financially attractive to HMOs primarily for two reasons:

Claims Review—Currently, the Medicare intermediaries and carriers are not at risk; they merely serve as conduits for HCFA funds. Therefore, they have little, if any, incentive to implement effective claims review processes. The freedom-of-choice HMO demonstrations, on the other hand, will be at financial risk to pay for Medicare covered services rendered to enrolled beneficiaries by non-HMO providers without referral or authorization by the HMO. Therefore, the HMOs will have a strong incentive to implement stringent claims review programs. Nonetheless, because all regular Medicare appeals processes for denied claims will be available to affected beneficiaries and providers, inappropriate claims denials by demonstration HMOs will be limited.

Utilization of HMO Services—Freedom-of-choice HMOs will be in an advantageous position to capture the utilization of enrolled beneficiaries, because:

Medicare beneficiaries generally suffer financial problems, and, therefore, are in need, often dire need, of methods for reducing their expenses. To the extent that cost savings are important to beneficiaries, they will have particularly strong incentives to use services provided directly through freedom-of-choice HMOs. Each time an enrolled beneficiary requires a health service, the beneficiary will have to decide whether to use the free services and extra benefits provided directly through the HMO or services rendered by non-HMO providers, in which case all Medicare cost sharing and limitations will apply.

While traditional HMOs offer Medicare beneficiaries an opportunity to reduce their expenses, many beneficiaries are afraid to enroll in HMOs because they fear loss of their Medicare benefits and/or because they relinquish their right to use non-HMO providers for at least 45-60 days.

Under the freedom-of-choice HMO demonstrations, beneficiaries will have an opportunity at least to try the services provided directly through the HMO with absolutely no risk or loss of freedom to use non-HMO providers.

The key to financial success of the freedom-of-choice HMO demonstrations will be the quality, acceptability, etc., of the HMOs' services. To the extent that enrolled beneficiaries find an HMO's services to be acceptable, the beneficiaries will continue to use the HMO's services; to the extent that enrolled beneficiaries find an HMO's services to be unacceptable, they will use services rendered by non-HMO providers without referral or authorization by the HMO.

EFFECTS OF COMPETITION

The freedom-of-choice HMO at risk approach should:

Stimulate HMO expansion.

Provide incentives for non-HMO providers to affiliate or develop relationships with HMOs.

HMO expansion will be stimulated through assignment of large numbers of Medicare beneficiaries to HMO's. This assignment of beneficiaries will provide an enrollment base that will help HMOs overcome the initial operating losses that generally are associated with the opening of new facilities or expansion into new geographic areas. Nonetheless, in order to assume the financial risks associated with use of non-HMO services by enrolled beneficiaries, as well as direct provisions of services by the HMO, the HMO will have to have a strong financial position.

Non-HMO providers may be more prone to affiliate or develop relationships with freedom-of-choice HMO demonstrations than with traditional HMOs, because the freedom-of-choice demonstrations will pose a more significant "threat" to the patient bases of non-HMO providers. That is, the freedom-of-choice demonstrations are predicated upon the assumption that freedom-of-choice HMOs will be more successful than traditional HMOs in inducing Medicare beneficiaries into utilization of the HMO system. In a traditional HMO setting, the beneficiary must sign an enrollment form in order to use the HMO; and, by signing the enrollment form, the beneficiary relinquishes the freedom to use non-HMO providers for at least 45-60 days. Beneficiaries are particularly fearful of this limitation and of losing their regular Medicare coverage. As a result, they are reluctant to enroll in traditional HMOs. However, beneficiaries enrolled in freedom-of-choice HMO demonstrations have the incentives of reduced cost sharing and increased benefits to induce them to use services provided directly through the HMO, on the one hand, while losing absolutely nothing by using the HMO's services, on the other hand. If beneficiaries are dissatisfied with the HMO's services for any reason whatsoever, they have the continuous freedom-of-choice to use any Medicare providers of their choice.

APPLICABILITY OF FREEDOM-OF-CHOICE HMO CONCEPT TO COMMERCIAL MARKETS

The freedom-of-choice HMO at risk concept is just as applicable in commercial markets as it is in the Medicare market. That is, employers may be viewed in the same light as HCFA. The freedom-of-choice HMO, in exchange for receiving all of an employer's employees, would continue to provide the same level of indemnity benefits as are currently offered by the employer for 95 percent of the employer's current costs for the indemnity plan. In addition, the HMO would make available added benefits, including elimination or reduction of patient cost sharing, to enrollees using services provided directly through the HMO. Enrollees using non-HMO services would not receive the added benefits offered by the HMO and would continue to be subject to all cost sharing and limitations imposed under the indemnity plan.

ADVANTAGE OF THE FREEDOM-OF-CHOICE HMO DEMONSTRATIONS

The main advantages of the freedom-of-choice HMO demonstration approach are threefold:

Because it will be to the HMO's economic advantage for Medicare beneficiaries to re-

ceive their services directly through the HMO, as opposed to using non-HMO providers without referral or authorization by the HMO, the HMO will be placed in a position in which it constantly must compete for the utilization of its members, who, in turn, always will have the option of using non-HMO providers without referral or authorization by the HMO. The result will be a self-regulating system in which Medicare beneficiaries will "vote with their feet". That is, to the extent that a beneficiary is not satisfied with the services provided directly through the HMO, for whatever reason, the beneficiary will use non-HMO providers without referral or authorization by the HMO. There will be continuous freedom-of-choice between use of HMO services and services rendered by non-HMO providers. As a result, the need for oversight and regulation will be reduced substantially, and the need for enrollment mix requirements such as the 50/50 rule under TEORA will be eliminated.

Because the HMO will maintain financial responsibility for payment of Medicare benefits for services rendered by non-HMO providers without referral or authorization by the HMO, the HMO will have a strong incentive to exercise stringent claims review, both with respect to coverage and with respect to medical necessity.

Because beneficiaries will be assigned randomly to participating HMOs, the problem of selection bias—both favorable and adverse—will be eliminated. Therefore, HCFA will be assured of a five percent saving in Medicare costs, based upon a payment level to the freedom-of-choice demonstration HMOs of 95 percent of the AAPCC. In addition, HCFA and the State also may realize savings in Medicaid costs.

SUMMARY

In sum, the freedom-of-choice HMO at risk demonstrations will make more benefits available to Medicare beneficiaries, while:

Saving HCFA five percent of the AAPCC for Medicare beneficiaries enrolled through the demonstrations.

Reducing substantially the need for oversight and regulation by HCFA and other State and Federal regulatory agencies.

Providing continuous freedom-of-choice for beneficiaries to use non-HMO providers exactly as they do at the present time.●

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR PRIVATE IMMIGRATION BILLS

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Immigration wishes to bring to the attention of our colleagues the new subcommittee "Rules of Procedure and Statement of Policy," for private immigration bills for the 99th Congress. The rules and statement of policy were approved by the subcommittee March 19, 1985, and by the full Committee on the Judiciary April 30, 1985.

Since the subcommittee acts as a court of equity in deciding whether to grant special relief in private immigration cases, it must reserve affirmative action to those of extraordinary merit and posing heavy hardship.

This subcommittee works hard and fairly to insure that meritorious private relief measures are passed and measures which lack merit or where there are other unexhausted avenues of relief are rejected.

The subcommittee has evolved, in the past few Congresses, a set of rules and procedures which assist you—as a possible author of a private relief bill—and the subcommittee in discharging those heavy burdens.

The rules of procedure adopted by each Congress draw on past subcommittee action and require extensive documentation. We offer the advice of our staff in how to gather the types of facts required in order to comply with the rules. A fully developed file not only serves the best interests of the subcommittee but also the Member who must later personally present the case at a hearing.

The subcommittee also provides another service to Members. It offers advisory opinions on cases which you may wish to bring to its attention. These opinions—just that—offer some perspective on future prospects for passage based on actions of the subcommittee over the years.

The "Rules of Procedure and Statement of Policy" are very similar to those of the 98th Congress. However, they have been altered with respect to private relief bills seeking naturalization of resident aliens and bills seeking residency for medical doctors and other medical professionals.

Also, a new policy adopted by the subcommittee requires successful beneficiaries to seek the relief granted by Congress—usually residency—within a time certain after the bill's enactment. Too often in the past bills were passed, but no effort was made by the beneficiaries to take advantage of relief—suggesting that relief was not necessary in the first place.

The subcommittee also reiterates that the mere introduction of a private bill does not in itself stay deportation. This rule has been in effect since 1971 and should be reviewed carefully (rule 4).

If you or your staff have any further questions, please do not hesitate to call the subcommittee.

Following are the rules and the statement of policy:

RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. The introduction of a private bill does not stay the deportation of aliens illegally in the United States or who have overstayed the terms of their visa. The Committee shall not intervene in any such deportation proceedings and it will not address any communications to the Attorney General to request stays of deportation on behalf of beneficiaries of private bills, except as indicated in Rule 4.

2. No bill shall be scheduled until all administrative remedies are exhausted, including suspension of deportation, asylum, and labor certification.

3. The Subcommittee shall not take any further action on legislation which has been tabled by the full Committee.

4. The Subcommittee shall entertain consideration of a request for a departmental report upon receipt of a letter from the author of the bill. In the case of beneficiaries who are in the United States, including those in parole status or asylee status, a determination on the request shall be subject to debate at a formal meeting of the Subcommittee and only those cases designed to prevent extreme hardship to the beneficiary or a U.S. citizen will merit a request for a report. The Immigration and Naturalization Service may honor a request for a report by staying deportation until final action is taken on the legislation.

5. Each bill in the following categories which may be proposed for consideration of the Subcommittee shall be subject to a point of order unless its consideration is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the Subcommittee.

(a) Bills not previously listed on an agenda for a meeting and those bills not in compliance with these Rules concerning the filing of documentation.

(b) Bills concerning beneficiaries who are receiving medical treatment, where documentation as to the availability of similar medical treatment in the beneficiary's home country has not been submitted.

(c) Bills concerning foreign medical graduates who have not passed the Foreign Medical Graduate Examination in the Medical Sciences (FMGEMS) and satisfied (or are exempt from) the two year foreign residence requirement.

(d) Bills relating to a waiver of the naturalization laws.

6. A quorum of the Subcommittee shall consist of two Members for the purpose of holding hearings on private bills.

7. Testimony at private bill hearings shall not be received from any person other than the author of the private bill. All requests to testify shall be addressed in writing to the Chairman of the Subcommittee.

8. No private bill shall be considered where court proceedings are pending.

9. The Subcommittee shall request reports on private bills from appropriate Federal agencies and/or Departments and shall await receipt of such reports before taking final action.

10. All requests for consideration of a private bill shall commence with a letter directed to the Chairman of the Subcommittee outlining relevant facts of the case and attaching thereto all pertinent data. The following shall be submitted in triplicate:

(a) Date and place of birth of all beneficiaries. Address and telephone number in the United States.

(b) Dates of all entries (legal and illegal) and departures from the United States and type of visas for admission. Consulate where the beneficiary obtained a visa for entry to the U.S.; or where the beneficiary shall seek a visa.

(c) Status of any proceedings with the INS and whether any non-immigrant or immigrant petitions have been filed on the beneficiary's behalf.

(d) Name, address, and telephone number of interested parties in the U.S.

(e) Name, address, dates and places of birth of all close relatives in the U.S. and abroad and their immigration status.

(f) Occupations, recent employment record and salary of beneficiaries.

(g) Copies of all communications to and from INS or the State Department, includ-

ing copy of an I-94, an Order to Show Cause and any other relevant information.

(h) A copy and summary of all litigation relating to the beneficiary's case.

The information above represents the minimum requirements for Subcommittee consideration. Pertinent data about the case and an explanation of the extreme hardship to the beneficiary or U.S. citizen must also accompany a request for processing of the private bill.

11. Action on legislation shall not be deferred on more than one occasion due to nonappearance of the author.

12. Documentation provided to the Subcommittee in order to comply with these Rules will only be accepted if submitted by the author of such bill.

13. Requests for consideration of a bill shall be accompanied by a statement by the beneficiary that he or she desires the relief sought by the bill and waiving the Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act.

14. A notice of meeting date shall be sent to the authors of all legislation which is scheduled.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

On March 19, 1985, the Subcommittee adopted as an addendum to its Rules of Procedure a Statement of Policy on private immigration bills which is set forth below.

The Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law has jurisdiction over all aspects of immigration law. In considering private immigration bills, the Subcommittee reviews cases which are of such an extraordinary nature that an exception to the law is needed. In fairness to those immigrants who are awaiting legal immigration, it is the policy of the Subcommittee generally to act favorably on only those private bills which meet certain precedents.

This policy statement will set forth the types of legislation which fall within the general parameters of favorable action and the criteria for reviewing certain categories of bills.

A. Adoption

Existing law provides for the immigration of foreign born adopted children if the adoption takes place while the child is under the age of 16 and (1) the child is an "orphan" as defined by immigration law or (2) the child has resided with the adopted parents two years. Those cases where the Subcommittee has favorable precedents are when the child is of a young age and there has been a long-standing parent-child relationship. In support of any private bill relating to adoption, the following must accompany the request for Subcommittee action:

(1) Home-study on the home of the prospective parents.

(2) Evidence of support of child—cancelled checks, letters, clothing.

(3) Statement detailing ages and occupation of natural parents and brothers and sisters.

(4) Communications with the Immigration and Naturalization Service regarding applicable U.S. adoption laws.

B. Doctors and Nurses

The Immigration and Nationality Act provides for the admission of foreign medical graduates if the doctor or nurse has passed certain exams required prior to seeking immigration. A doctor must pass the Foreign Medical Graduate Examination in the Medical Sciences (FMGEMS)—formerly the Visa Qualifying Exam—which is given extensively throughout the world and a nurse must pass the Commission on Graduate Foreign Nurses Exam (CGFNS).

Any alien seeking immigration must also have a job offer certified by the Department of Labor indicating there will be no displacement of U.S. Labor.

In the past several years, the Subcommittee has experienced a deluge of bills introduced on behalf of foreign medical graduates. The legislative history relating to this group indicates many doctors enter the United States as non-immigrants with the clear intention of remaining permanently. Legislation enacted in 1976 and 1977 sought to tighten the law requiring the return of such doctors to their home country; and recent legislation in 1981 generously grandfathered certain doctors for admission as permanent residence because of their length of time in the U.S. It is the Subcommittee's opinion the 1981 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act was the final chapter in a long and arduous struggle to provide equity to certain foreign medical graduates.

The Subcommittee is also dismayed to find that doctors who are beneficiaries of private laws often swiftly seek more lucrative employment upon gaining permanent residence, thereby leaving medically underserved areas without any medical assistance. Because of these experiences, the Subcommittee intends to look with very little favor on doctor bills. Further, if a bill on behalf of a doctor or nurse is pursued, the following is required before scheduling will occur:

(1) Passage of the Foreign Medical Graduate Examination in the Medical Sciences for doctors, and the Commission on Graduate Foreign Nurses Exam for nurses.

(2) Residence by the doctor or the nurse in a health manpower shortage area, or a recommendation by a U.S. Government Agency indicating the doctor or nurse's services are needed. It is the Subcommittee's desire that the beneficiary show substantial community ties over a long period of time. Extensive periods of residence would give the Subcommittee some assurance there is every likelihood the doctor or nurse would maintain residence in the area and provide medical services.

(3) Waiver of the two-year foreign residence requirement (this applies to all exchange visitors).

(4) Documentation as to efforts the institution has made to recruit U.S. citizens for the position. Such information shall include salary levels of other doctors or nurses on staff and an explanation as to recruitment techniques on employment of the beneficiary.

(5) Copies of annual affidavits executed by participants in foreign medical graduate exchange programs.

Legislation approved by the Subcommittee on behalf of doctors shall provide for suspension of deportation during an interim period while a doctor is serving in a community and permit adjustment of status to permanent residence upon completion of the designated time period.

C. Drugs and Criminal Activity

The Subcommittee has few precedents for waiving grounds of exclusion relating to criminal activity. In the event such a bill is pursued, the following documents where available will be required:

(1) Complete transcripts of court proceedings relating to the conviction.

(2) All other records relating to offenses, including state, and local police records.

(3) Waiver of Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Act by the beneficiary.

(4) An affidavit (notarized) from the beneficiary describing his criminal record in full.

It is the intent of the Subcommittee that all available information be submitted to the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee will conduct its own investigation with appropriate government agencies.

It is also the Subcommittee's desire to review testimony and affidavits relating to the beneficiary's behavior after any criminal offense. Such information is helpful in making a determination as to whether legislation will serve the best interests of the community. In this regard, letters of reference, bank records, and employment records are particularly helpful.

D. Medical Cases

The Subcommittee shall be reluctant to schedule bills on behalf of persons who enter the United States on nonimmigrant visas or who are paroled for the purpose of seeking medical treatment. This type of visa is available to accommodate persons seeking advanced medical treatment which may be available only in the United States.

Many cases have come to the attention of the Subcommittee where the medical visa is used to enter the U.S., and shortly thereafter, the person seeks permanent immigration. This type of activity undermines the intent of the medical visa; and flagrant abuses may seriously jeopardize its availability for those whose only recourse is treatment in the United States.

The Subcommittee's reluctance to schedule such bills is based on the premise that persons may seek all available medical assistance while in the United States, but upon completion of any medical treatment the purpose of the visa expires and the alien must return home.

The Subcommittee also notes the increasing number of private bills in similar cases whereby the beneficiary seeks relief solely on the basis of the need for medical treatment for physical conditions which were present at the time of admission or developed after arrival in the U.S. It is therefore the policy of the Subcommittee in such cases that advisory opinions be sought by the author from such organizations as the World Health Organization and the Pan American Health Organization as well as from officials of the beneficiary's home country concerning the availability of medical treatment for such physical conditions.

E. Deferred Action Cases

The Subcommittee shall be reluctant to schedule any bills on behalf of aliens who are in "deferred" status. It is the Subcommittee's understanding that the Immigration and Naturalization Service reserves the conferral of such status to cases of a particularly compelling nature. In view of INS action in this regard, the Subcommittee does not see any need for legislative action.

F. Investors

Recent public legislation enacted on behalf of investors provided relief for persons who were able to establish their qualification for a nonpreference visa prior to June 1978.

The Subcommittee has studied the many cases relating to investors and has found many beneficiaries did not sufficiently acquaint themselves with the law prior to making an investment and operated under illusions with respect to qualifying for immigration.

It is the Subcommittee's opinion that most investors who entered the United States after the June 1978 date were aware that immigrant visas would not be available

in the foreseeable future, and there are no precedents for enactment of a private law solely based on a person's investment in the United States.

In the event a Member wishes to pursue this type of bill, the following is required: tax records, contracts, bank statements, and other pertinent information relating to the investment.

G. Waiver of Exclusions

1. Health—All bills waiving the grounds of exclusion for mental or physical infirmities will require the posting of a bond. The Subcommittee notes there are few precedents for cases in this category. In order to obtain the best possible information, the Subcommittee will require all medical records as well as information from the state and/or federal government concerning possible public charge aspects of the case.

2. Draft Dodgers—There are few precedents for favorable action on behalf of draft dodgers, and it shall be the Subcommittee's policy to continue to view such bills unsympathetically.

3. Fraud—The Subcommittee has been extremely reluctant to act favorably on cases involving visa fraud, and it shall be the policy of the Subcommittee to adhere closely to precedents in this category.

H. Naturalization

The Subcommittee shall require any bill relating to expediting naturalization be accompanied by evidence indicating such action would be in the national interest, as opposed to personal gain. There are few precedents for favorable action on bills waiving any naturalization requirements or granting posthumous or honorary citizenship. It is the Subcommittee's intent generally to view unfavorably legislation in this area and notes more appropriate mechanisms for rewarding individuals may be in the form of honoraria, medals, awards, statues, etc. The Subcommittee also notes there are few instances of favorable action on behalf of individuals who renounce U.S. citizenship, and the policy of the Subcommittee shall be to adhere to precedents in this category.

I. Bills Tabled in a Previous Congress

Commenting on requests for reconsideration of legislation, Thomas Jefferson noted the right of reconsideration is not "a right to waste the time of the House in repeated agitations of the same question, so that it shall never know when a question is done with."

The Subcommittee has been confronted with an increasing number of requests for reconsideration of private bills which have been tabled by the full Committee in previous Congresses. It has been the experience of the Subcommittee that each bill is given sufficient review during the meetings of the Subcommittee and the authors are afforded ample time to present the merits of the case. Repetitious consideration of these cases operates to the detriment of other private bills which are pending and reflects poorly on the integrity of the private bill process. For these reasons, the Subcommittee will be reluctant to reverse or reconsider its prior action absent new evidence or information that was not available or could not have been obtained by the author at the time of actual consideration by the Subcommittee.

J. Timeframe for Obtaining Relief Upon Enactment of a Private Law

The Subcommittee has monitored the situations concerning the applications for

relief by beneficiaries of private immigration laws and expresses its concern that in many cases the subjects of private bills do not exercise their petition for relief after enactment in a timely manner.

Certain cases have come to the Subcommittee's attention whereby relief after enactment of a private law was not sought until 10 years thereafter, and other cases the Subcommittee is dismayed to learn that beneficiaries have not sought immediate relief.

In view of the lengthy deliberations by the Subcommittee on each bill processed under its jurisdiction, it appears incumbent upon the Subcommittee to assure that the beneficiaries of such bills apply themselves in a diligent manner and seek relief as expeditiously as possible upon enactment. Therefore, the Subcommittee shall amend each private bill processed so that the beneficiaries must apply for the benefits of the enacted law within two years of notification of the passage of the private law.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EVANS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT) for this week, on account of observing Illinois National Guard training and a personal fact-finding visit to several Central American countries.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PEPPER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. GAYDOS, for 30 minutes, May 14.
Mr. GAYDOS, for 30 minutes, May 15.
Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 60 minutes, May 22.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VANDER JAGT.
Mr. PARRIS.
Mr. ROTH.
Mr. SHUMWAY.
Mrs. ROUKEMA.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mrs. BURTON of California.
Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.
Mr. HALL of Ohio.
Mr. ROYBAL.
Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. PEPPER.
 Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.
 Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.
 Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.
 Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.
 Mr. BONER of Tennessee in 10 instances.
 Mr. MILLER of California.
 Mr. HUBBARD.
 Mr. STARK.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 14, 1985, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1267. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on U.S. expenditures in support of NATO, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928 nt.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1268. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, transmitting a copy of the administration's annual energy review 1984, pursuant to FEAA, section 57(a)(2) (90 Stat. 1139; 91 Stat. 572); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1269. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Department of the Navy's proposed letter of offer to Spain for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 85-10), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1270. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 122b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1271. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the annual report of the administration's activities under the Freedom of Information Act covering calendar year 1984, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1272. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Mineral Institute annual report for 1984, pursuant to Public Law 98-409, section 4(c); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1273. A letter from the Chairman, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, transmitting the 1984 annual report of the Corporation, pursuant to Public Law 92-578, section 11; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1274. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as amended, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1275. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title I of the Salmon and Steelhead Conservation and Enhancement Act of 1980, as amended, to repeal the Salmon Vessel Buy-Back Program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1276. A letter from the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the educational assistance programs for veterans and eligible persons; to repeal the Education Loan Program; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1277. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a copy of a final rule on notification requirements and reportable quantity adjustments; a proposed rule on reportable quantity adjustments, pursuant to Public Law 96-510, section 305(a); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

1278. A letter from the Federal Inspector, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System, transmitting the 23d quarterly report on the status of the system, pursuant to Public Law 94-586, section 7(a)(5)(E); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

1279. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission on Agricultural Trade and Export Policy, transmitting the interim report of findings and recommendations of the Commission, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1691 nt.; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House of May 9, 1985, the following report was filed on May 10, 1985]

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1868. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to protect beneficiaries under the health care programs of that act from unfit health care practitioners, and otherwise to improve the antifraud provisions of that act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-80, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

[Pursuant to the order of the House of May 8, 1985, the following report was filed on May 10, 1985]

Mr. ASPIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 1872. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 99-81). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 13, 1985]

Mr. ACKERMAN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 1534. A bill to convert the temporary authority to allow

Federal employees to work on a flexible or compressed schedule under title 5, United States Code, into permanent authority (Rept. No. 99-82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 934. A bill to provide certain authority to reduce erosion within the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 99-83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 105. A bill to provide for the inclusion of the Washington Square area within Independence National Park, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 99-84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 439. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the selection of the court of appeals to decide multiple appeals filed with respect to the same agency order (Rept. No. 99-85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL

Under clause 5 of Rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

Referral of H.R. 1931 to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation extended for a period ending not later than May 14, 1985.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1203. A bill to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl and to offset or prevent the serious loss of wetlands by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential habitat, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for a period ending not later than May 14, 1985, for consideration of such provisions of the bill as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 1(1), rule X (Rept. No. 99-86 Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 2468. A bill to amend the Legal Services Corporation to authorize appropriations for additional fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEPTEL of Hawaii:

H.R. 2469. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to require that the U.S. Postal Service report to Congress at least 60 days before acting on any decision to close or consolidate a post office; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. REGULA):

H.R. 2470. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to improve the criteria used to select projects for grants under the Urban Development Action Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself, Mr. FRANK, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 2471. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to ensure fair and adequate financing of the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Program by reducing Social Security tax rates and applying the reduced rates to all wages and self-employment income of covered workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. BOGGS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. LONG, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. OAKAR, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. YATES, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. MINETA, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. DIXON, Mr. STARK, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MOODY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. FISH, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. ROE, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BONKER, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FLORIO, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee):

H.R. 2472. A bill to ensure economic equity for American women by providing retirement security for women as workers and as divorced or surviving spouses; making quality dependent care available to all working families; ending discrimination in insurance on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex, and improving health care coverage for displaced homemakers; providing equal employment opportunity and pay equity for women; and treating women and low-income families more equitably under the tax laws and tax reform proposals; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor; Ways and Means; Armed Services; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Energy and Commerce; Post Office and Civil Service; House Administration; and Small Business.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2473. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny a deduction for amounts paid as restitution or other damages for violations of law involving

fraud; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COELHO:

H.J. Res. 286. Joint resolution designating May 1985 as "National Play-It-Safe Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California (for himself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. MINETA):

H. Res. 168. Resolution directing the Director of Central Intelligence to provide to the House of Representatives documents and factual information in possession of the Central Intelligence Agency about covert training or other support during the past year for counterterrorist units in the Middle East; to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

121. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to terminal cancer patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

122. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

123. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to the issuance of a commemorative bicentennial stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 52: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 156: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 521: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 753: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 930: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. BENNETT.

H.R. 1031: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HAYES, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HEPTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1032: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HAYES, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HEPTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1099: Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 1267: Mr. COBLE, Mr. OLIN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. HATCHER.

H.R. 1401: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 1402: Mrs. BENTLEY and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1403: Mrs. BENTLEY and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1467: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1509: Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 1534: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1544: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1579: Mrs. BENTLEY and Mrs. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1927: Mr. LEHMAN of California.

H.R. 1940: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. DASCHLE, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.R. 1942: Mr. LaFALCE.

H.R. 2001: Mr. SHELBY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COELHO, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BARNES, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. REGULA, Mr. BATES, Mr. LATTI, Mr. ROE, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. YATES, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. BEILSON, and Mr. THOMAS of California.

H.R. 2221: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 2282: Mr. CARPER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 2329: Mr. LEVINE of California and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 2401: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. LELAND, and Mr. MOODY.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. COBEY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MOODY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.J. Res. 65: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.J. Res. 68: Mr. MURPHY.

H.J. Res. 135: Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LENT, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. BOSCO, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.J. Res. 183: Mr. MINETA, Mr. DIOGUARDIA, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. COELHO, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. HEPTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. YATES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DAUB, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.J. Res. 285: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. PRICE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. ROWLAND of Geor-

gia, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. REID, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. FISH, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. RUDD, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WISE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. IRELAND, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. LENT and Mr. McHUGH.

H. Con. Res. 131: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. TAYLOR.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

104. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of trustees, the City University of New York, NY, relative to the Pell grant budget proposed by the administration for fiscal year 1985; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

105. Also, petition of the Vietnamese Association of Central Florida, Orlando, FL, relative to the freedom fighters in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

106. Also, petition of the board of aldermen, Chelsea, MA, relative to the President's proposed budget cuts fiscal year 1986; to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1872

By Mr. FOGLIETTA:

—At the end of title 10 add the following new section on page 200, following line 4: SEC. 1050. SDI OVERSIGHT COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.—There is hereby established a commission to be known as the "Congressional Commission on Strategic Defense".

The Commission shall monitor the progress of Strategic Defense Initiative programs and particularly shall—

(1) study the feasibility and technology of SDI programs;

(2) study adherence of SDI programs to the 1972 ABM Treaty and any other treaty and the effect of such programs on any treaty; and

(3) review strategic defense programs of the Soviet Union.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—(1) The Commission shall be composed of twelve members appointed for six-year terms. The members of the Commission shall be appointed as follows:

(A) Three members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(B) Three members shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(C) Three members shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate.

(D) Three members shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(2) Members of the Commission shall be appointed based upon recognized expertise in matters relating to the Strategic Defense Initiative and shall be selected from among persons who are particularly qualified by reason of training, experience, and knowledge for service on the Commission.

(3) In the event of a vacancy in the Commission, the vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(4) Of the members first appointed to the Commission, four shall serve for two years, four shall serve for four years, and four shall serve for six years, as determined by lots at the first meeting of the Commission.

(c) CHAIRMAN.—The members of the Commission shall select the chairman of the Commission.

(d) SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Commission shall receive necessary support services and funding from the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization of the Department of Defense. Each Commission member is entitled to appoint one staff person.

(e) REPORTS.—(1) The Commission shall submit an annual report to Congress on the Strategic Defense Initiative. The report shall be submitted in both a classified and unclassified form.

(2) The Commission shall submit to Congress such reports as it considers appropriate on any report to Congress by the Secretary of Defense concerning the Strategic Defense Initiative.

(3) Reports to Congress by the Commission shall be submitted without intervening review or approval within the Executive branch.